THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXLII, No. 3 MARCH, 1960

CONTENTS

A Study of Catholic Consanguineous Marriages
Raymond H. Reis, S.J., and Robert Hoene, S.J. 145

The Church Offers the Mass. Part I. *John L. Murphy* 164

Mirror of Justice *David Granfield, O.S.B.* 178

The Vatican Council and Canonicity *John J. O'Rourke* 183

The Priest and the Ascetical Cultivation of the Faith
Joseph Clifford Fenton 189

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

The Ambry 199

Tabernacle Key 199

The Reason for Joining the Catholic Church 201

Cheating in Schools and Colleges 202

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1960 by The Catholic University of America Press.

(Contents continued from previous page)

Lack of Reverence among the Laity 203

Confirmation of a Retarded Child 204

BOOK REVIEWS

John Wesley and the Catholic Church, *by John M. Todd* 206

Finding God in All Things.
Translated by William J. Young, S.J. 207

One Fold. *Edited by Edward Hanahoe, S.A., and Titus Cranny, S.A.* 209

The Devil's Advocate, *by Morris L. West* 211

The Light of the World, *by Benedict Baur, O.S.B.* 212

BOOKS RECEIVED 214

Institute of Spiritual Theology

Ninth Summer Session

July 5 to July 29

DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES

River Forest, Illinois

An integrated course in spiritual theology and allied subjects for the spiritual director offered to all priests and professed brothers by a staff of Dominican theologians.

Limited accommodations for resident students.

For information and prospectus of courses write to

Fr. Jordan Aumann, O. P.,
Institute of Spiritual Theology,
Dominican House of Studies,
River Forest, Illinois.

A STUDY OF CATHOLIC CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES

It would appear superfluous to call attention to the increasing interest of the Church in scientific matters, especially those that may affect the daily lives of her children. Mention need but be made of the revival in vigor and stature of the Pontifical Academy of Science. The world-wide attention that was given to the publication of *Humani generis* is further proof of this interest. The eager fidelity of the late Pontiff, Pius XII, to address the various national and international scientific associations meeting in Rome is a well-known fact. Very frequently on these occasions Pius XII would specifically point out the solution to purely scientific problems affecting the everyday lives, happiness and social well-being of Catholics. He was using the opportunity of showing the concern of *Mater Ecclesia* for the total good of her children: spiritual, social and economic.

On two occasions during the month of September, 1958 alone, Pius XII gave demonstrable evidence of His keen interest in the practical significance of scientific problems affecting the daily lives of his subjects. On September 5, 1958 he addressed The International Congress on Blood Transfusion. In his own words:

> . . . the gravity of the questions to be treated attracts Our attention in a particular way; the Church does not remain indifferent, as you know, whenever there is question of problems which involve human destiny, individual and social, temporal and eternal; whenever she can, by her presence or by a timely intervention, accomplish much good or avoid much evil.[1]

Pius XII called attention to "the necessity of furnishing the public with indispensable information concerning the blood and its heredity, in order to allow individuals and families to be on guard against lamentable consequences." [2] He singled out with high words of praise as worthy of imitation the "Dight Institute" which "engaged and married couples could consult with full con-

[1] Discourse of His Holiness Pope Pius XII to the members of the International Congress on Blood Transfusion, September 5, 1958.
[2] *Ibid.*

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

fidence on questions of heredity, in order to have greater assurance of happiness and security in their union. These centers would not only give information but would help interested persons to apply efficacious remedies." [3] Of special interest in the present context are his words:

> Let us recall in this connection that the community of blood between persons, whether in families or in collective groups, imposes certain duties. Although the formal elements of every human community are of the psychological and moral order, the lineal descent is its material basis which must be respected and in no way harmed.[4]

In his discourse to the Seventh International Congress of Hematology Pius XII replied in detail to specific questions that were proposed which affected the economic, biological and moral lives of Catholics. He recommended "the prenuptial visit and in particular the blood test, in Italy and the Mediterranean basin" [5] as a precaution of the engaged couple against defective offspring arising from haemotological disorders: ". . . and if the danger is really serious, it [prenuptial visit] could even be imposed in certain provinces and localities." [6] Pertinent specifically to the problem of consanguineous marriages are his words:

> You ask, finally, if it is permitted to make propaganda on the technical level in order to emphasize the dangers inherent in a marriage between persons with blood relationship. Without any doubt it is useful to inform the public of the serious risks which marriages of this kind entail. Here again account will be taken of the gravity of the danger in order to judge the moral obligation.[7]

In both replies, the Pope advocated voluntary submission of information by the lay public to competent scientists so as to prevent or alleviate the consequences of hidden hereditary defects. In both instances, as well as in many others during his busy lifetime, he was exemplifying the deep concern of *Mater Ecclesia* for the spiritual, economic and biological well-being of her children. There can be no doubt of his attitude toward the propriety of gathering

[3] *Ibid.*
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] Discourse of His Holiness Pope Pius XII to the members of the Seventh International Congress of Hematology, Sept. 12, 1958.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] *Ibid.*

genetic data from the faithful for the purpose of advising them and others in a similar situation as to the possible unhappy effects on their offspring of the hidden recessive genes which they might be carrying.

PROBLEMS OF CONSANGUINEOUS UNIONS

The central problem confronting close blood relatives who have married is to estimate the possible genetic effects on the children of such a consanguineous union. This can be done by comparison of a group of marriages of first cousins with a control group of families containing a sister or brother of one of those first cousins. By such a process, genetic differences in the children of the two families are made patent. In case of abnormalities in the consanguineous family it is possible to ascertain whether these abnormalities are the result of inbreeding or mere chance. Furthermore, an insight is gained into the larger problem of the genetic qualities of the population in general, especially as regards hidden recessive abnormalities.

Human genetics is a difficult study because controlled matings and controlled environments are not feasible. Men, after all, are not mere animals. Specific mathematical techniques are available, however, which can be applied to those matings which have actually taken place between persons closely related by blood. It is known that marriages of this type which can afford valuable data for study have actually been contracted. The problem is to find the individuals who have entered into a matrimonial union with their first cousins, interview them, and analyze the data. The interview must be conducted in such a way that the truth concerning the hereditary characteristics will be made manifest. To attain this, the progeny of the marriage must be studied.

The married sibs (sisters and brothers) of the first cousins would naturally be of value as controls for comparisons. Statistics dealing with frequencies of cousin marriages, with the span of time between marriage and arrival of first child, and with general customs built around marriage must be kept in mind, both during an interview and in judging the results of the study. A biased interviewer, after all, can usually elicit the type of answer he would like to hear.

This approach to human genetics through first-cousin marriages can possibly shed light on some of the following problems: 1)

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

presence of recessive genes responsible for increased pathologic conditions in offspring; 2) causative action of recessive genes with respect to stillbirth and to early death of the fetus, to sterility, and to low intellectual capacity of progeny; 3) possibility of predicting healthy or abnormal children likely to issue from a consanguineous marriage.

Marriage between individuals closely related by blood, even those of brothers and sisters, probably are not prohibited by the *natural law* in the foremost of its secondary precepts. As St. Thomas points out, *primary* precepts of the natural law, e.g., "good is to be done, evil avoided," are known by all men as principles "written in their hearts." They are known by the very operation of the intellectual faculties and are self-evident to all who possess human nature. Foremost among the *secondary* precepts of the natural law are such realities as "Thou shall not kill" and other similar mandates. These conclusions are reached by reasoning, and are thus reached by all those who have attained the use of reason. Now the statement has been made that conjugal unions between individuals closely related by blood, even those of brothers and sisters, probably are not prohibited by the natural law in the foremost of its secondary precepts. Witness, for instance, the account of Genesis, where the marriage of brother and sister was probably the rule for some generations. But with the progress of the human race, there is progress in culture and wisdom. It is likely, therefore, that the prohibition of marriage between members of the immediate family was a product of cultural progress. One might say that the prohibition of "incest" evolved with the cultural development of the human race.

The Code of Hammurabi as well as the Hittite laws reflect the awareness of man that the conjugal union is communally, civilly or racially important and that a marriage between persons too closely related by blood is morally wrong in some manner, at least in that it does not contribute to the good of the clan or tribe as it should. No mention of a biological reason is made. The laws found in the Book of Leviticus come from an early age also. They, too, show the awareness which man has of his human nature with its rights and obligations. These laws are similar, then, to the laws of the ethnic groups existing within that Near East area at the time, exemplified in the Hittite laws and the Code of Hammurabi. But

the prohibitions of Leviticus have an added value demanding close adherence in that they are contained in Holy Scripture. Thus, they erected a more completed moral norm by which God guided His chosen people. Being so solidly established, they naturally found ready acceptance in the Christian dispensation. The Catholic Church demanded as a minimum the observance of these laws for the sanctification of family and community life. St. Paul, we know, condemned in stern terms a documented case of incest.

The Church has, then, incorporated the natural and levitical laws. The Church's own positive law prohibiting a matrimonial union between those closely related by blood clearly acted as a standard, a norm, a guide to the young people of Christian communities contemplating marriage. In early Christian ages, when entire populations lived within a walled town, as the families grew they were forced to live in more and more crowded quarters. The Church by its legislation effectively guided this family life which was so tightly confined within the dwelling by demanding of the young people that they look outside of their immediate relatives for valid marriage partners. The Church imposed an impediment upon a union even between cousins. The dispensation from this impediment was granted reluctantly and only after apparent failure to dissuade the parties. There was another motive, and that a purely spiritual one, to the formulation of this law by the Catholic Church. If marriage partnerships are formed among an ever widening circle of human beings, friendships are founded between new families and thus the universal law of charity, the love of one's neighbors, gradually encompasses ever larger groups of God's children.

As centuries went on, the Church relied increasingly upon the more general prohibition of Leviticus that "relatives ought not to marry" as a basic norm. The Roman inheritance laws, delineating those who inherit goods by lawful right, provided a practical standard for estimating the degree of kinship. The German system of evaluating relationship came into more general use in the later Middle Ages. From this system we have inherited the now well-known formula of prohibition "within the third degree of kindred" of Canon 1076.

As the original and apparently simple injunction of Leviticus, "relatives should not marry," was debated by Canonists throughout the centuries, the accumulated confusion and diversity of opinion

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

was gradually circumscribed, and the authority of the Church over Christian marriage was ever more clarified and precisely formulated in ecclesiastical law.

That the Catholic Church has the *power* to dispense from the prohibition of the positive law forbidding consanguineous marriages between Catholics we see through its actions both in the past and in the present time. She requires a dispensation from the impediment of consanguinity within the second and third degrees of kindred for a valid marriage. In this sense the Catholic Church restricts the marriage of close relatives, but she may dispense for serious reasons. If such a dispensation is granted, an accurate record is kept in the proper ecclesiastical files. It was from such records as these that data for the present study were obtained.

Historical records clearly indicate that inbreeding, incest, or consanguineous marriage, regardless of how they are termed, have been prevalent in human society from the beginning. The more swiftly moving modern societies plainly show a decrease in such matings, and that for many reasons. First of all, families tend to disperse widely, thus lessening the chance of marriage between relatives. Furthermore, even when families tend to remain in the same geographical area, because of ease of travel social relations amongst territorially distant groups have become very prevalent; the young people mix with friends from many areas. The incidence of consanguineous marriages in the past, however, has much pertinence to the current analysis of human populations, for it has its effect on the present human gene pool.

Scientific knowledge of the effects of human inbreeding has been developed only recently. It is true, a "taboo" against incest gradually arose among primitive peoples, but anthropologists do not agree as to how the taboo grew. Many geneticists today when dealing with the problem of inbreeding too readily perhaps read modern biological concepts into the writings of earlier men. Thus, many are inclined to conjecture that early man must have known something of the biological ill-effects of inbreeding to make him formulate "laws" restricting such marriages.

If there was any scientific writing on this subject in an early period of man's history, it still remains to be discovered. Possibly the first indication of a *biological* reason underlying the Church's prohibition comes at a comparatively late date in the history of

such legislation.[8] St. Augustine of Canterbury found that amongst certain tribes marriages of first cousins were rather common. He appealed to Pope St. Gregory concerning the problem since he did not wish to bind unduly the native Angles by a foreign law and thus hamper the acceptability of Christianity. The answer from St. Gregory was an insistence on the basic law, but permission was given to dispense in cases involving third and fourth generations. A reason for urging the basic is given: "Through experience we learn that from such unions good children do not grow up." Its authenticity has been doubted.

Yet the eighth century statement strikes a note in harmony with widely published findings in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the United States where we observe the Bible to be used as law by a good many fundamentalists, and where the Catholic Church's law is fairly well known; and where, besides, we have many states with their laws absolutely prohibiting marriages of first cousins, most people will express surprise to find that the arguments establishing these laws in their primary formulas were expressly moral rather than biological.

SOURCE OF DATA ON CONSANGUINEOUS UNIONS

The Catholic Church alone has reliable records of consanguineous marriages because of two factors. First of all, this results from the requirement of a dispensation for a closely related couple to enter the matrimonial contract. Again, a record is kept, permanent and in safe keeping, for the good of the marriage bond and as another proof of valid marriage.

In the present study proper ecclesiastical permission for interviews and the use of the marriage record books was duly obtained. From these books the names of the first cousins who married during the years 1936-1956 were selected. These married people were then sought out through the use of individual parish records; knowledge of their whereabouts was ascertained from their previous or present pastors, from friends, relatives, witnesses of the marriage, and, as a final resort, from the telephone book.

The individuals were then located and interviewed. All data secured from these interviews were kept strictly confidential. The

[8] M. Verbaarschot, "De juridica natura impedementi consanguinitatis," in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 30 (1954) 697-739; 714.

knowledge that all information would be held in confidence made for an honest, truthful, and complete interview. All interviews were made by either one of the two authors.

Questions asked during the interview were of a nature to uncover hereditary characteristics among the progeny. A control couple was also interviewed, i.e., the married sister or married brother of the wife or husband in the consanguineous marriage. Since highly confidential information was given, the data were transferred to codified forms in such a way that competent geneticists and statisticians could examine the raw data and at the same time not learn the source of these data. The analysed material was placed on IBM cards for further study.

Some 256 marriages of first cousins were gathered from chancery files. The dispensations for these were granted during the years 1936-1956. Another 16 marriages were obtained through parish rectories or through acquaintances. Some of these 16 had moved into the diocese from another state. Thus there were 272 potential cases for this study.

Of the 272, definite knowledge was secured concerning 251. Either they were actually interviewed or it was definitely established that they had died, moved to another city, or simply disappeared so that their present whereabouts were not ascertainable.

Of the 251 families that were interviewed, 109 had married at a period of life when under normal physiological conditions the husband could fertilize the wife and the woman was competent to conceive. Many of the remaining 142 cases could not be used on this study because: 1) they were more distantly related than full first cousins, e.g., second cousins or half first cousins; 2) they were related by marriage and not by blood; 3) a not inconsiderable number had married at a time when the wife was more than 36 years of age, thus limiting the physiological possibility of conception.

Analysis of all data has been limited to these 109 consanguineous families. They were distributed as follows: 106 full first-cousin marriages; one union between double first-cousins; one marriage of an uncle with his niece; one aunt-nephew union.

Controls of similar age, social, religious and economic milieu would be most desirable, as the children would then be more comparable. Selection for a control was most difficult; it was not possible to obtain a control for each first-cousin family. Furthermore,

the ideals of the sister or brother used as a control often differed considerably. Could one be sure, for example, that the control couple tried with equal diligence to have children, to care for their health, to educate them? Nevertheless, each control family was taken as it was found to avoid any bias.

Interviews were had with 85 control families. In 50 of these the control family was that of the sister of the one who had married her first cousin. The control group follows the nationality of the consanguineous to some extent; i.e., at least on the side of the sister or brother chosen.

When the parties with consanguineous union were approached, only five of them refused to be interviewed. Those who were interviewed made it easy to arrange to see the control family. The ready co-operation of both consanguineous and control families adds assurance to the accuracy of the data received.

The largest group was Italian (45 of the 109 families); 41% of the consanguineous marriages. The nationality of the other groups was as follows: Polish-Polish 18; other East European 8; German-German 8; Irish-Irish 8; others 8; mixed in both 14.

It must be recalled that the cousins are related through their parents. This can be a basis for recording the "type of marriage" among the consanguineous. In 39 of the consanguineous couples, the relationship was through their mothers; i.e., their mothers were sisters. The other three possible combinations were practically equal in number, about 22 in each group. In these groups the parents were related as brothers or as brother and sister or as a sister and brother.

There was a frequency of only 0.1% of first-cousin marriages in the Catholic population of Chicago in 1936. It has since decreased to less than 1/20 of 1%. Statistics are not available on the frequency of first-cousin marriages of Catholics in relation to the population in general of the United States.

The 45 Italian families had 71 liveborn children; the 18 Polish had 29; the 8 East European had 16; the 8 German had 14; the 8 Irish had 15; the 14 mixed had 42 liveborn children. The 109 families had a total of 209 liveborn children or an average of 1.9 children per family. If we consider the fertile families only, there were 2.27 children per family of the first cousins and 2.32 for the family of their sisters or brothers used as a control. It must

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

be remembered that many of these families are still young. They can be expected, therefore, to have more children, which will raise the average to about three children per family.

By way of comparison, a college study of 1956 will be of some assistance. With respect "to graduates of 25 years ago the highest number of children per parent (3.36 for males, 3.18 for females) and per married graduate (3.08 for males, 2.62 for females) is shown by Roman Catholic colleges." [9]

If we consider the proportion of the total number of children in both groups at various age levels, it will be found that up to their 14th birthday there is very little difference. This agreement helps for an analysis of any conditions whose onset begins at an age of *less* than 14 years. About one-third of the marriages took place between 1936 and 1938. Thus, some 30 per cent of the children in these families were between their 14th and 19th birthdays at the time of the interview. The control couples, having married a bit earlier or later than their brother or sister in the first-cousin union, have their children more evenly spaced across the years. No conclusions in this investigation are dependent upon conditions with an age of onset greater than the 14th birthday (schooling is the only exception).

A number of the older children of the first-cousin marriages have themselves become married, but no analysis of their offspring has been made. Of course, the normal averages of outbreeding should show in their children. No special problems have been called to the attention of the interviewers.

Among the first-cousin families 20 were childless; whereas there were 12 among the controls. There were 23 one-child families among the experimental and 17 in the control families. There were 36 consanguineous families that had 2 children; 33 control families had 2 children. Only one family among the first cousins had six children. There were two of the 85 control families with six children.

REASONS FOR CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES

Various reasons were given by these first cousins for entering upon the consanguineous union. Nearly two-thirds of them volun-

[9] Population Reference Bureau, 1956.

teered the information that they had not even known one another until they were in their adult life. Some few among the Italian group had been "promised" when they were babies and the parents saw to it that the promise was kept. In rare cases the first cousins lived in intimate contact with one another due to confined living quarters and thus knew one another thoroughly from their youth. Most frequently, however, there was an ordinary courtship and an eventual marriage after the intricacies of the legal restrictions, both civil and ecclesiastical, had been surmounted.

If we look to the reasons for the laws of the Church regarding marriage between persons closely related by blood, it is evident that the purpose of these laws is well attained. The consanguineous marriages are enduring. These couples have made fine homes and rear their children in a happy family circle. For the most part they are living good wholesome Catholic lives. This factor seems to have had an excellent influence on the physical health as well as on the development of the mental abilities of the children. Most of the consanguineous couples seriously thought out the physical, psychological, and social problems which their marriage would entail, and have faced the challenge admirably. Some few who worried excessively or who were unduly badgered by their family or acquaintances show very clearly the marks of such influence upon themselves and their families. The overwhelming majority of these consanguineous couples were deeply interested in this study.

Of the 109 cases of marriage between first cousins, six have resulted in divorce. There were three divorces in which neither of the parties married again. Only three marriages have ended in divorce in which both individuals have "attempted" marriage a second time. In these three, all six persons have remarried civilly.

Among the 85 control families, the parties have been involved in 12 divorces. Actually, two of these were separations from a common law union. Three have ended in divorce and the persons have not entered into a second marriage. But seven have "attempted" a civil marriage or are trying to live in such unions.

Furthermore, in the control group there were eight marriages in which one or both parties had previously been married and this marriage subsequently ended in divorce. This first marriage which ended in divorce very clearly affects the stability of their present unions and the general tone of their family life.

In the 12 divorces of the control group, five stated that drinking to excess was a large factor in the separation, whereas injustice and incompatibility accounted for the other "causes."' Among the cousins, drink was stated to be the reason in one case. Injustice, especially leading to incompatibility, contributed to the severance of the other five marital unions among the first cousins.

There were 23 first-cousin marriages in which nearly two years elapsed before the marriage was validated, but there were often extrinsic reasons for this. The tangle of natural, civil and ecclesiastical law takes time to unravel. Only two of the controls listed somewhat similar reasons for allowing time to elapse before the validation of their marriage.

ABNORMALITIES

Since the abnormalities range from the very serious to minor among the children, generalizations are rather difficult. There are about *twice* as many abnormalities among the children of the first cousins. It is possible that the consanguineous couples remembered minor ailments of their children and learned more about them than did the control couples, with the result that the count is a little higher than it should be. A larger number of male children seemed to be affected.

The abnormalities occurring in infancy of the children of the first-cousin marriages include hydrocephaly, double hernia, defective hearing, deafness, blindness, poor heart and respiration, mental retardation, cerebral palsy, enlarged thymus, convulsions, pneumonia and cleft palate. Occurring later on were such maladies as rheumatic fever, nervous eczema, Osgood-Slaughter's disease, spinal meningitis, polio and spinal curvature. Among the children of the first cousins there were 31 serious ailments, against only three among the infants in the control and 13 in the older children of this group. Thus, there was approximately twice as much sickness among the children of the first cousins who married as in the families of their sisters or brothers. It must be remembered, however, that there were more children in the consanguineous group than in the control.

The rates of stillbirth and miscarriage are *low* in both groups and occur with about the same degree of frequency in both. There were only three stillbirths among the consanguineous couples and

one in the controls. There were 36 miscarriages among 23 first-cousin mothers; 18 control mothers had 26 miscarriages. There was very little difference in the age of the fetus at the time of abortion.

Of the first-cousin women who had children, 25.0% had one or more miscarriages; 14.5% of all pregnancies have resulted in a miscarriage. There were one or more miscarriages in 23.6% of the control women and 12.8% of all their pregnancies terminated in a miscarriage.

One of the goals of this study was to find out if there were any added risks of harm to the children born of a first-cousin marriage. It would seem extremely doubtful that there is any added possibility of loss of fetus through miscarriage or stillbirth.

The most serious difference in the children of the two groups lies in the large number of *early deaths* among the children born to the first cousins; 17 were dead by January, 1957. Four died within the first week of life and the other seven at various ages up to ten years. Only four of the control children died before the age of 20, three having died on the day of birth and one at the age of one year. Thus, there are more than *four times* as many deaths in the consanguineous families as in the controls, but we must keep in mind the larger number of children in the consanguineous families. Only 12 of the first-cousin families have been involved in the 17 deaths. In one family four children died by the age of ten; two families lost two children each within less than a week after birth. The one family with the four deaths has lived in poverty and was not able to secure medical care comparable to most other families. Such a large factor as this makes contrast in deaths less absolute and the statistics derived a little less certain.

Two deaths have taken place after the age of 20: one child of the experimental has died at 20 years of age of an earlier brain hemorrhage and one child of the control at 21 because of a rheumatic heart. There were no deaths by accidents. Death certificates were examined for all children except for three who died outside the State of Illinois.

That there is an added risk of increased sickness, abnormalities and early death cannot be doubted. The controls show a rather low rate of death and sickness but it is in harmony with the national

figures. The early death rate of children is *three times* as great in the consanguineous families as in the control families: 17 of 209 livebirths as compared to four of 172 livebirths. The rate of all diseases, serious and light, of the experimental is almost double that of the control group. If only the more crippling diseases are considered, the added risk to children of first-cousin marriage is very great. The reason for this statement lies in the curious fact that *no* serious abnormalities were found in the control children. Among the 192 first-cousin children were seven or eight with serious abnormalities as compared to none among the 168 children of the control. This would seem to indicate that in the group studied there is an added risk to life and health for 12% of the progeny of first-cousin couples as compared to the conceptions and progeny brought into being through outbreeding.

Just as good medical care was available to the first-cousin families as to the controls, generally speaking. This can be determined by the frequency of the more routine medical procedures. Thus, 86 experimental and 76 control children had their tonsils removed; 13 experimental and 13 control had appendectomies; of these later 10 experimental and seven controls have had both appendix and tonsils removed. These routine operations have been only slightly more frequent among the controls.

As an index of the frequency of accidental occurrences, among the control and experimental alike, inquiry was made concerning broken bones. It was learned that 13 of the experimental and nine of the control children each had one broken bone. One additional control had three broken bones. Thus, children with broken bones occur in almost *identical* ratio among the two groups.

The three families which have a greater degree of consanguinity than merely that of full first cousins have not contributed to the abnormalities observed among the experimental children.

INTELLIGENCE OF CHILDREN

The average schooling of all parents combined amounted to about ten years. First-cousin husbands have had almost two more years schooling than their wives, whereas control wives had had one year more schooling than their husbands. Consanguineous couples have had about ¾ year more school on the average than the controls. The average schooling for the large number of Italian

families in the first-cousin group amounts to 9.2 years. Several of the parties had come from Italy where the home was relied upon more heavily than the school.

The families are young ones, generally speaking. Thus, of the first-cousin families there are 40 children not in school because they are under age and 32 of the control children are not yet of age.

It was not possible to secure an I.Q. rating for all of the children, whether experimental or control, since some of them were pre-school age and for others the records were not available. Records were secured, however, for 79 experimental children and for 64 controls. A variety of tests had been given in both parochial and public elementary and high schools. These figures were all converted to the Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Tests scores.

There were 44 of the 79 experimental children with an I.Q. of 100 or better; 20 had a score between 90 and 99. One child scored 57; all the others were at least 74 or better. At the other end of the scale there were 8 children with a score between 116 and 154, the highest score for all children, both experimental and control.

The control children showed no essential difference from the experimental. There were 40 out of the 64 control children whose I.Q. score was 100 or better; 17 were between 90 and 99. The lowest score of a control child was 81; 6 experimental children had a lower score. The highest score among the control children was 133; of the experimental 154. There were 10 control children with a score between 116 and 133.

As in so many other aspects of this study, the experimental and control children appear to be quite normal in their I.Q. score. Certainly they are not significantly lower in intelligence or achievement in school than their cousins.

Among the first cousins, men of 29.4 years (mean age) have married women of 24.6 years (mean age); these figures are based on 108 families. Marriage took place somewhat earlier in the control families. In these, the men were 26.8 years (mean age) and the women were 22.8 years (mean age), based on 82 families. In about 10% of both groups the wife was older than the husband at the time of marriage. About half of the families involved in a divorce were still within the fruitful period. Had the marriage gone on, additional children might have been born to them.

Not all of the investigated families have finished their child-bearing period. In 40 of the first-cousin marriages, the mothers had a pregnancy within the six years preceding the interviews. The same was true of 27 of the wives in the control families. This would seem to indicate that a moderate proportion of the families will probably have additional children. This will introduce a bias into some of the observations made thus far; e.g., it is known that parental age and birth rank both influence the frequency of abnormalities in the children. Thus, the observed proportion of abnormal children may be a bit *lower* than the eventual, true proportion, for these families, both experimental and control.

The frequency of families in which the wife has never been pregnant is 15.6% in the consanguineous marriages and 13.3% in their sisters. These values do not differ much, if the small number of families is considered. There is a difference, however, when length of marriage is considered. Although 15 of the sterile consanguineous couples have been married and remained together for 10 years, only five of the sterile control couples have been married as long.

Many of the parents stated: "People say that consanguinity has bad effects on the children." The extent to which such an opinion may have affected the fertility of some families is questionable. Most of the sterile families have expressed regret concerning their lack of children. Some have adopted children.

The median age of marriage of the sterile women is about two years greater in each group than the median age of marriage of those women who have had children.

In the consanguineous families the median time to first birth is 17.8 months, so far as 70 firstborn children are concerned. Absent from this calculation are those children who were born before the eighth month of marriage. In 65 of the control families, the median time for the first born is 23.7 months. Contrary to expectation the consanguineous group had the first child faster, i.e., six months sooner, on the average, than their sisters or brothers.

In 64 of the first-cousin families supplying adequate data, the time between births of the first and second child is 27.5 months. Among the 55 families of the controls, however, there is an interval of 36.5 months. Thus, the controls, on the average, had a nine-month longer interval between the first and second child. Consequently, there would not seem to be any lethal acting influence in

the consanguineous families which would prevent early conception or repeated conceptions.

Any discussion of comparisons must take the whole subject into view to arrive at valid conclusions. The human subject is so complex, and in family and social institutions so varied, as to defy complete analysis. It was, however, the considered opinion of the two priest-investigators that the first-cousin couples, having gone through so much adversity to create families and homes, were living most compatibly. This perhaps helped promote the good health of the children, and may even have had its effect on preventing the recessive genes present from operating to their full capacity. It was sometimes difficult to find a control couple because of the marital instability of some brothers or sisters.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the fact that a number of tests have been performed on these data and that there has been much selection by the authors of the data that was included in any given test, doubt must exist concerning some conclusions drawn from some of the tests. A number of differences, however, do clearly exist between the two groups. The major valued conclusions concern the fertility of these marriages, the viability of the fetuses, viability and health of the children and the family life.

That sterility exists among married couples is a well-documented fact. One would expect any hereditary mechanism capable of causing sterility to be clearly operative in married first cousins. Yet, on the contrary, not only do the first cousins have their first child but also the second child *sooner* than their sisters or brothers. The same has been found to be true with respect to first births in a large population of Japanese.[10] Yet this is not universally true of all first cousins who marry regardless of the nationality.[11] Hence the findings in this study need further corroboration.

Consanguinity apparently has little if any effect on miscarriages and stillbirths. From all stages beginning with that of conception

[10] W. J. Schull, "Empirical Risks in Consanguineous Marriages: Sex Ratio, Malformation, and Viability," in *American Journ. Human Genet.* 10 (1958) 294-343.

[11] P. Remlinger and D. Coen, "Les mariages consanguins chez les Israelites marocains," *Bull. Nat. Acad. de Med.* 131 (1947) 494-498.

and going on to birth, consanguinity evidently produces no retarding influence.

Children born to first-cousin parents, however, manifest a very evident higher *death rate*. It is, of course, a known fact that some types of abnormality have a higher frequency among children of first-cousin marriages. The relative frequency which has appeared in this study is high. The death rate is three times as high as for the controls and the general population of Chicago for comparable ages. Likewise the frequency of serious *abnormalities* among the living children is well above the normal level for this geographical area. The rate of all abnormalities is almost double in the children of the first-cousin marriages as compared to the control families.

Calculations have been made for the number of abnormal recessive genes in the parental background of the children of these first-cousin families, using the data derived from this study of consanguineous marriages. Those interested in the more precise scientific aspects of this and similar studies can consult the proper literature.[12] Suffice it to say here that the total number of lethal recessive genes operating from early miscarriage through the juvenile period would approximate 2.46. The number bringing about subsequent abnormalities and death would be in the neighborhood of 2.03 recessive genes. From this it appears that the parents carried perhaps about 4.5 abnormal recessive genes. The failure to observe all the children through the entire juvenile period (many are still juveniles) should indicate that this estimate is, to some extent, lower than that which actually exists.

SUMMARY

The frequent pronouncements of the late Pontiff, Pius XII, have made it abundantly clear that the Church is concerned for the social and economic, no less than the moral well-being of her children. With respect to the problem of consanguineous marriages, the regulations of the Church concerning the marriage of first cousins are based on moral as well as ascetical grounds. So far as the Chicago area is concerned, the number of first cousins marrying one another at present is less than 1/20th of 1%. Those of Italian descent seemed to predominate in this type of union. The

[12] H. Slatis, R. H. Reis, and R. Hoene, "Consanguineous Marriages in the Chicago Region," in *American Journ. Human Genet.* 10 (1958) 446-464.

home life of these couples is generally superior to that of their brothers or sisters. The marriage bond is more permanent. The number of children per family is quite small, approximately two. There apparently is very little, if any, increase in miscarriages or stillbirths. The number of early deaths is about three times as high as that of the children in the general population. Abnormalities, both serious and light, likewise are much higher. With respect to the children, there is an added risk of about 12.4% so far as miscarriage, stillbirth, neonatal death, infantile and juvenile death and general abnormalities are concerned. The intelligence of the children of such unions is generally equal to that of the children of the brothers or sisters of those who had married their first cousins.

RAYMOND H. REIS, S.J.
ROBERT HOENE, S.J.

Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

THE CHURCH OFFERS THE MASS

I.

Two encyclicals of Pius XII stand out as particularly important for the progress of dogmatic theology: *Mystici Corporis,* on the nature of the Church, and *Mediator Dei,* on the nature of the liturgy. Both of them were summaries, on the part of the *magisterium,* of the increasingly clear teaching of theologians throughout the last century. The encyclical on the liturgy, however, presupposed the teachings of the encyclical on the Church; it is only in the light of the nature of the Church itself that we can grasp the full meaning of the liturgical life of that Church.

Besides settling disputed points and pointing out erroneous solutions, these letters of Pius XII set forth a positive doctrine that would serve as a basis for future theological discussion. They mark a great step forward in the official teaching of the Church, but at the same time they indicate the general direction to be followed in our attempts to clarify even further certain questions which still remain somewhat vague.

Of all of the points in the field of dogma that concern the Sacrifice of the Mass, possibly no question has been aided more by these encyclicals than the concept of *ecclesia offert:* in what manner may the Church be said to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass?[1]

[1] In regard to this general topic, cf.: B. Augier, "Le sacrifice ecclésiastique. II: L'exercice du sacrifice ecclésiastique à la messe," *Revue Thomiste,* 17 (1934) 201-223; B. Capelle, "Le chrétian offert avec le Christ," *Questions liturgiques et paroissiales,* 19 (1934) 299-314; 20 (1935) 3-17; B. Capelle, "Nos sacrifices et le sacrifice du Christ à la messe," in *Le messe et sa catéchèse* (Paris, 1947), p. 154 ff.; B. Capelle, *Pour une meilleure intelligence de la messe* (Paris, 1947); Y. Congar, "La participation des fidèles à l'offrande de l'Eucharistie d'après la tradition et le magistère catholique," *Lumière et vie,* 7 (1952) 54-72; A. Croegaert, "L'église oblatrice première et universelle du saint sacrifice," *Cours et conférences des semaines liturgiques,* 6 (Mont-César, 1928) 229-237; G. de Broglie, "Du rôle de l'église dans le sacrifice eucharistique," *Nouvelle revue théologique,* 70 (1948) 449-460; G. de Broglie, "La messe, oblation collective de la communauté chrétienne," *Gregorianum,* 30 (1949) 534-561; G. Diekmann, "With Christ in the Mass," *Christ's Sacrifice and Ours* (Boston: The Liturgical Conference, 1948), pp. 42-48; B. Durst, *Das Wesen der Eucharistiefeier und*

In the first encyclical, that on the Mystical Body, Pius XII touched upon the relationship of the Church to the eucharistic Sacrifice in a very brief fashion towards the end of Part Two of the document. His primary concern in *Mystici Corporis* was the organic unity of the Church itself, in its being, as it were. The activity of the Church in the Sacrifice of the Mass is a further extension of this basic truth, and hence it is only touched upon in this instance:

> By means of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Christ our Lord willed to give to the faithful a striking *manifestation* of our union among ourselves and with our divine Head, wonderful as it is and beyond all praise. For in this Sacrifice the sacred minister acts as the vicegerent [*vices gerunt*] not only of our Saviour but of the whole Mystical Body and of each one of the faithful. In this act of Sacrifice through the hands of the priest, by whose word alone the Immaculate Lamb is present on the altar, the *faithful* themselves, united with him in prayer and desire, *offer* to the Eternal Father a most acceptable victim of praise and propitiation for the needs of the whole Church. And as the Divine Redeemer, when dying on the Cross, offered Himself to the Eternal Father as Head of the whole human race, so "in this clean oblation" He offers to the heavenly Father not only Himself as Head of the Church, but in Himself His mystical members also, since He

---

des Christlichen Priestertums (Rome: Studia Anselmiana, XXXII: Herder, 1953); B. Durst, "Wie sind die Gläubigen an der Feier der heiligen Messe beteiligt?" *Benediktinische Monatschrift,* 25 (1949) 337-354; 417-434; 26 (1950) 1-18; 100-118; 193-209; Erni, Gugler, et al., *Das Opfer der Kirche. Exegetische, dogmatische und pastoral-theologische Studien zum Verständnis der Messe* (Luzern, 1954); J. C. Fenton, "The Act of the Mystical Body," *American Ecclesiastical Review,* 100 (1939) 397-408; A. Loth, "La participation des fidèles au saint sacrifice de la messe," *Revue anglo-romaine, 2* (1896) 145-159; P. Oppenheim, "Vom sozialen Character der heiligen Messe," *Liturgisches Leben,* 4 (1937) 237-251; K. Rahner, "Die vielen Messen und das eine Opfer," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,* 71 (1949) 257-317; K. Rahner, "Die vielen Messen als die vielen Opfer Christi,'" *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,* 77 (1955) 94-101; P. Rupprecht, "Una eademque hostia—idem offerens," *Theologische Quartalschrift,* 120 (1939) 1-36; S. Tromp, "Quo sensu in sacrificio missae offerat ecclesia, offerant fideles," *Periodica,* 30 (1941) 266-273; A. Vonier, *Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (Westminster, Md., 1946); A. Vonier, "La sacrifice des croyants," *La vie spirituelle,* 51 (1937) 113-128.—A long list of references is given by Schmaus along with his discussion of this topic: M. Schmaus, *Katholische Dogmatik,* IV, 1: *Die Lehre von dem Sakramenten* (Munich: Hueber, 1957) 323-330; 761-766.

holds them all, even those who are weak and ailing, in His most loving Heart.[2]

In a far more extended fashion, Pius XII returns to this same teaching in the encyclical on the liturgy. The doctrine of *Mediator Dei* is really summed up in this earlier encyclical on the Church, but it is to this second document above all that we look for a clear statement of precisely *how* the faithful "offer" the Sacrifice of the Mass, and in what precise manner the sacred minister acts as the representative of the faithful.

It is with this problem that we would concern ourselves at present. Before passing on to the question proper, however, it is necessary to emphasize a number of preliminary points which will serve as a basis for our solution. We will consider these, then, in this first section, and return to the basic problem in the second.

(1) When we use the term "Church" in this question, it is necessary to clarify our terms. The question is sometimes phrased in these words: "In what manner do the faithful participate in the Sacrifice of the Mass?" In other words, by the phrase "the Church offers," we want to indicate more than merely that activity which flows from the sacrament of Holy Orders. Our concern here is primarily for the *entire* Church, the social organism of Christ's Mystical Body, made up both of ordained priests and also of those not sealed with the mark of Holy Orders.

There have been, in general, two approaches to this problem in recent literature, neither doing full justice to the teaching of the Church. There are those who so emphasize the role of the ordained priest, that the faithful are excluded entirely from the activity proper to the Mass. These theologians will admit that the people are *benefited* by the Mass, and that they are living members of the Church that *has* the Sacrifice of the Mass. Their role is reduced to passivity, and seeks expression only by the inward approval of that which the priest is accomplishing at the altar.[3]

[2] *Mystici corporis Christi* (NCWC edition) pargh. 82; *AAS*, 35 (1943) 232: "In eo enim sacrorum administri non solum Servatoris nostri *vices gerunt*, sed totius etiam mystici Corporis singulorumque fidelium; itemque in eo christifideles ipsimet immaculatum Agnum. . . . Aeterno Patri porrigunt. . . ."

[3] Cf. de Broglie, *Nouvelle revue théologique, loc. cit.*, pp. 451, 455; also Tromp, *loc. cit.*, p. 267.

On the other hand, there are those who feel that unless every single individual contributes *in the same fashion* to the performance of that act by which the Mass is essentially constituted, there can be no question of real "participation." As a result, they have tended to obscure the clear-cut lines which divide the ordained priest from the laity, which separate the sacramental power of Holy Orders from the general "priesthood of the laity," based primarily upon the baptismal character.

The first error (that which excludes the faithful entirely from the action of the Mass) is ultimately an outgrowth of a faulty ecclesiology. As we shall note later on, the solution to the problem we have posed is to be found first of all in our treatise on the Church. If we fail to understand properly the social nature of the Church, we cannot grasp the further conclusion in regard to the role of all the members of Christ's Church in the Mass.[4]

The second error (that which tends to confuse the power of the priest and the role of the laity) is due, in large part, to our present-day "democratic" approach to life, our emphasis upon the common and mutual activity of the entire community. We tend to pass over the truth that one individual can perform an action or a ceremony in the name of others, and by that very fact make them *participate* in that activity.[5] This is, once again, a failure to appreciate the nature of the Mystical Body, which is aptly described as a moral body *plus* something else. It is an entirely unique organism, in which the actions of the individual members are properly attributed to the entire body.[6]

(2) It is well to note that we are attempting to discuss the *manner* in which the Church offers the Sacrifice of the Mass; we have not asked simply "whether" the Church—the entire social body offers that Sacrifice. This fact we take for granted. It is so clear in the teaching of the Church and is re-echoed so frequently

[4] We might cite as an example of such a difficulty the position of J. Brosnan in "The Act of the Mystical Body," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 102 (1940) 306-317. Because of his acceptance of the "soul of the Church" explanation current in some circles before the encyclical, *Mystici corporis*, Brosnan could not admit the notion of the Mass as an "act" that pertained to the entire Mystical Body.

[5] Cf. de Broglie, *Gregorianum, loc. cit.*, p. 553; *Nouvelle revue théologique, loc. cit.*, p. 455.

[6] Cf. Tromp, *loc. cit.*, p. 269; de Broglie, *Gregorianum, loc. cit.*, p. 542.

in the accounts of tradition that Tromp could justly conclude in 1941 that it must be held absolutely, and that one could not deny it without grave temerity.[7] Since the appearance of *Mediator Dei* in 1947, we might well attribute to this teaching the theological note of "Catholic Doctrine," understanding by this that type of truth which, although not proposed infallibly by the Church, is nevertheless taught authentically and expressly (in this instance, by means of a papal encyclical).

It is above all in the statements of the Council of Trent that we find the first clear statement of this teaching in these precise words in official decrees. In the twenty-second session, the Council noted that "Christ Himself was this new Pasch, to be *offered by the Church* through her priests under visible signs. . . ." [8]

In the sixth chapter of the decree of this session, the Council also defends the celebration of Masses in which only the priest communicates, by pointing out that even these Masses are *public* Masses: ". . . partly because the people communicate spiritually at such Masses, and partly because they are celebrated *by a public minister* of the Church, not for himself alone, but for *all* the faithful who pertain to the Body of Christ." [9]

In the twelfth century, Cardinal Lother (later Pope Innocent III) had expressed a similar notion in his work, *De sacro altaris mysterio:* "Although only one offers the Sacrifice, nevertheless he speaks in the plural: 'We offer,' since the priest sacrifices not only in his own, but in the person of the entire Church." [10]

This entire doctrine, however, has been explained in the greatest detail in those sections of *Mediator Dei* which treat of the Sacrifice of the Mass; it is these passages with which we will be concerned above all in what we have to say.

(3) There is a third truth that should also be kept in mind in all of these discussions, one brought out most strongly in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the New Testament era, there is one—and only one—Sacrifice. The Epistle emphasizes above all that there is no longer a place for the sacrifices of the Old Testament, but this

[7] Cf. Tromp, *loc. cit.*, p. 266.
[8] *Denz.*, 938.
[9] *Denz.*, 944.
[10] Lothar (Innocent III), *De sacro altaris mysterio*, III, 5: *PL*, 217:844.

means at the same time that no *other* sacrifice except that of Christ either has or can take their place. Thus in Chapter Ten we read.

> It is in this "will" that we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest indeed stands daily ministering, and often offering the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin; but Jesus, having offered one sacrifice for sins, has taken his seat forever at the right hand of God, waiting thenceforth until his enemies be made the footstool under His feet. For by one offering he has perfected forever those who are sanctified.[11]

This is a passage that has been made famous in the discussions concerning the Mass, especially those carried on at the time of the Protestant Reformation.[12] Its chief theme, however, is clear: By this one offering (whether this *oblatio* be understood as indicating the "gift offered" or the "action of offering"), Christ has accomplished all that may be accomplished in the way of sacrifice.[13] To speak of any other independent sacrifice would be to do injustice to His supreme and all-sufficing Sacrifice upon Calvary.

It was this thought that preoccupied the minds of the Fathers at the Council of Trent, as a study of the *Acta* of the Council indicates, and which brought them to emphasize most clearly the essentially relative nature of the Mass.[14] Their teaching was not based upon theological speculation, but upon the clear testimony of the ***magisterium*** down through the ages. It found its clearest expression, however, in the Tridentine phrase: *"Una eademque hostia—idem offerens:* For it is one and the same Victim, He who now makes the offering through the ministry of priests and He who then offered Himself on the cross; the only difference is in the manner of the offering." [15]

[11] *Heb.* 10:10-14.

[12] Cf. C. Spicq, *L'épître aux Hébreux* (Paris: Gabalda, 1953), II, *ad loc.*; P. Rupprecht, "Una oblatione consummavit: Die Bedeutung von Hebr. 10, 14 für die Messopferlehre," *Theologische Quartalschrift,* 121 (1940) 1-13.

[13] Cf. Rupprecht, *loc. cit.,* pp. 1 ff.; Spicq. *op cit.,* II, 311-312.

[14] Cf. *Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, actorum, epistolarum, tractatuum nova collectio* (ed. Societatis Goerresianae: Freiburg. 1901 ff.), VIII, 728/30; 730/26; 738/20; 745/12; 765/14; 766/35; 769/29 (with 739/26); 782/33; 784/26.

[15] *Denz.,* 940.—Cf. also in this regard: de la Taille, *Mysterium fidei* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1950), Thesis XXVI: p. 234.

As a result, we may not speak of the "sacrifice of the Church" in any sense at all, as a completely distinct sacrifice that may in some manner be *associated* with the Sacrifice of Christ. That which the Church "offers" is, essentially, and must be nothing other than, the Sacrifice of Christ.[16] It is not a new, a different or a distinct sacrifice in that sense; quite the contrary, it represents fundamentally the Church's action in the sacrificial activity of Christ Himself.

It is on this point that some confusion may still be prevalent. We can find Catholic authors who speak of the "Church's own sacrifice," as if it were something distinct from the Sacrifice of Christ (which, of course, they teach is *also* offered by the Church).[17] Or they will tend to speak of the offering of bread and wine as the offering of the Church, as though this would in some way constitute the "sacrifice" of the Church: the first-fruits of creation.[18] Yet as Guy de Broglie emphasized so strongly: "For the faithful to offer to the Church the fruits of the earth, or even the bread and wine destined for the Sacrifice, will always be, in itself, quite another thing from the offering to God of the Immolated Christ." [19]

[16] It has been noted often before that many theories on the Mass have tended to be too independent of the Cross, particularly those which look for a type of destruction in the Mass itself. It remains difficult to see in some of them precisely how the Mass remains an essentially relative Sacrifice. Cf. E. Doronzo, "On the Essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass," *Proceedings, The Catholic Theological Society of America* (1952), pp. 53-80.

[17] E.g., Y. Congar tends to give this impression: "La participation des fidèles à l'offrande de l'Eucharistie d'après la tradition et le magistère catholique," *Lumière et vie*, 7 (1952) 58: "Nevertheless the Mass is only the Sacrifice of Christ insofar as it is offered *by Christ Himself*. It is also the Sacrifice of the *Church*, and this in two ways: a) the Sacrifice of Christ is offered *by the Church;* b) the Church offers there *her own sacrifice (son propre sacrifice)* in and by that of Christ."

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 59: "There is no daily 'repetition' *(recommencement)*, no daily actualisation of the Sacrifice of Christ in the sacramental celebration, except by insertion in the rite where the Church, first of all, offers bread and wine, both as the first fruits of creation, as the symbols of her own spiritual sacrifice, and at the same time, as the symbols or the sacramental 'species' of the Sacrafice of Christ. . . ."—Also, p. 60: "He [Christ] inserts the memorial of His death (in the celebration of which the priest acts as the sacramental minister *of Christ—in persona Christi*) into the worshipful celebration of the Church, where the priest acts as the minister *of the Church.*"—Cf. also, pp. 63-64.

[19] de Broglie, *Gregorianum, loc. cit.*, p. 559, note 10.

In a somewhat similar fashion, in discussions of liturgical rites, there are some writers who tend to speak of the "sacrifice of the Church" as beginning to take shape from the start of the Mass, although it reaches its culmination in the Consecration. As it is presented, we are lead to think that the priest acts first as the delegate of the Christian community, and then later he begins to act also as the instrument of Christ. As these theologians explain it, the commission of Christ is superimposed on the priest, but he does not thereby cease to be the delegate of the Church; it is in this way, they note, that the Church and her sacrifice are able to "enter into" the Sacrifice of Christ.[20]

There is some fear that what is expressed here might be described as a form of "sacrificial Nestorianism." In these explanations, there is ultimately only "one sacrifice—one oblation"; but we must take care not to give the impression that even for an instant there is any kind of "ecclesiastical sacrifice" that exists independently of the Sacrifice of Christ. In the New Testament era, there is and can be no other Sacrifice than that of the Cross. In explaining "what" the Church offers, therefore, we must emphasize that it is primarily and basically the Sacrifice of Christ Himself, to which are joined the members of Christ both as co-offerers and as co-victims. But they exist as such only in and with Christ.

[20] E.g. Jungmann tends to give this impression in his approach: *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, translated by Brunner (New York: Benziger, 1950) I, 190: "And now looking at it more closely, how is this self-oblation of the Church accomplished? The action which brings this about precisely is —again—the consecration. The same act which realizes the sacrifice of Christ also realizes the sacrifice of the Church, but with this difference, that the Church's sacrifice begins to take shape from the very start of the Mass and then receives the divine seal and acceptance when at the consecration Christ takes it in hand, and, after richly ennobling it, offers it to His heavenly Father as His own. For the priest who performs the consecration in Christ's name and with Christ's power is always at the same time acting on commission from the Church. . . . As their [the faithful's] representative he stands at the altar. He consecrates the bread and chalice to present Golgotha's sacrifice to almighty God as their own. And since all through the course of the Mass he acts and speaks not simply in his own name but on commission from the Church, this authorization does not cease at the moment of transsubstantiation merely because Christ's commission is superimposed, for it is the Church that calls on him to accept this second commission so that she, as the Bride of Christ, might once more enter into His sacrifice." Also I, 191, note 49: "The priest's representing

(4) There is a fourth preliminary point that concerns the nature of sacrifice itself. In this regard, we have an enlightening statement of the Magisterium in *Mediator Dei,* a teaching based upon the general doctrine of the Scholastics, of St. Thomas especially.

We might note in passing that upon occasion we refer to the Mass as "the greatest prayer." This is actually to use the term "prayer" in a very extended sense; in the interests of clarity, we might ask if it would not be better to avoid such an expression entirely. The Sacrifice of the Mass is above all and essentially an *act.* While we do use prayers *in* the Mass, it is important to note that essentially the Mass, precisely as a Sacrifice, is something that is *done* rather than something that is *said.*

This becomes especially clear if we place the Mass (and the liturgy in general) in the framework of the virtue of *religion,* as does Pius XII in *Mediator Dei:*

> It is unquestionably the fundamental duty of man to orientate his person and his life towards God. . . . But man turns properly to God when he acknowledges His supreme majesty and supreme authority; when he accepts divinely revealed truths with a submissive mind; when he scrupulously obeys divine law, centering in God his every act and aspiration; when he accords, in short, due worship to the One True God by practicing the virtue of *religion.*[21]

This is the general approach associated with the traditional teaching on the virtue of religion. Our starting place is the virtue of justice, by which we render to each one what is his due. This will also include our relations with God, and we therefore describe this as the virtue of religion—one of what St. Thomas describes as the quasi-potential parts of the virtue of justice.[22] The primary concern of the virtue of religion, however, is not God Himself, but precisely the *worship* that is due God: "It pertains to the virtue of religion to show reverence to the One True God: to give unto Him the honor due Him." [23]

Christ and his representing the Church are not parallel; they are disposed one behind the other. . . ." This same approach is evidenced in Jungmann"s work: *The Sacrifice of the Church,* translated by Howell (London: Challoner, 1956), pp. 8-10.

[21] *Mediator Dei* (NCWC edition, 1948), par. 13.

[22] II-II, q. 81-100.

[23] II-II, q. 81, art. 2.

We might sum up the various things associated with the virtue of religion in this fashion:

Worship is given to God by:

I) Interior acts of religion
II) Exterior acts of religion:
  A) Vocal Prayer
  B) Outward Actions
  C) Offerings to God:
    1) Simple Offerings
    2) Sacrifice — Internal element; External, ritual element

Among the various acts customarily included in this virtue, we distinguish first of all between the interior and the exterior acts. The interior acts are concerned especially with adoration, thanksgiving, sorrow, petition, or with purely mental prayer. Such acts of themselves demand no outward expression; they are primarily a disposition of soul, acts of the intellect and the will. Generally, however, they are associated with exterior acts; thus we can note that the sacrificial offering has both an internal and an external (ritual) element. While sacrifice itself is essentially an outward act, it would be a meaningless thing if the internal element were not present. In this instance, however, the interior element in sacrifice seeks expression in the outward act of sacrifice; thus we single out other purely internal acts, complete in themselves, apart from any further outward expression.

The exterior acts include actions of different types. There is, first of all, *vocal prayer* (either public or private); in this we express our interior sentiments by means of words recited aloud. The divine office is *the* prayer by which God is worshipped, "the prayer of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, offered to God in the name and on behalf of all Christians," according to *Mediator Dei.*[24]

There are also certain "outward actions," or "externalized acts," by which—without words—we express openly our interior sentiments: genuflections, for example, or prostrations. Related to this would also be the seven sacraments, which are acts of exterior

[24] *Mediator Dei*, par. 142.

worship, both in their reception and in their administering.[25] They are not purely "outward actions," however, since the essential *form* involves words as well as actions; but they seem to be related to this category.

From all of these, however, we must distinguish in a special way those acts of worship which may be termed in a general way "offerings to God." There is something special associated with these acts that is not found in the other categories. In this instance, worship is shown to God by an act, an activity by which we *give* something over to God; this very act of giving is the sign of our worship.

This might be what we could term a "simple offering"—the giving, for example, of something to be used in divine worship, such as a chalice, an altar, or money for things used in divine services. This outward "giving" indicates our inner dispositions, and is sometimes referred to as a "sacrifice" in the broad sense: a form of self-discipline, giving up something or doing something extra for the love of God. The Lenten "sacrifices" that we offer to God would fit into this group. The notion involves depriving ourselves of something, and giving it over, in certain instances, to God—offering it to Him in some way.

Distinct from this, however, is "sacrifice" in the proper sense of the term. This is a specific type of "offering," that includes certain elements over and above the notion of a "simple giving" of something to God. Theologians will debate endlessly about the precise notion of sacrifice and its exact definition, but all will agree that a sacrifice will involve a material, sensible object that is given over to God entirely, and that is also changed in some manner.[26]

Considering these various divisions, we can easily see the importance of not identifying "liturgy" with "sacrifice." Sacrifice is simply one facet of the liturgy. The entire liturgical life of the Church will include prayers (the divine office above all), the sacraments, as well as other external, although not sacrificial, acts (such as

[25] Cf. Van Roo, *De sacramentis in genere* (Rome: Universitas Gregoriana, 1957), pp. 62-68.

[26] It is not our intention to base our conclusions upon any particular theory. What we wish to emphasize is that in all theories, the Mass will remain essentially an *act*. The disputes concern only what is included in the essence of that sacrificial act.

Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament). The eucharistic Sacrifice, however, is, as Pius XII described it, the "culmination and center, as it were, of the Christian religion . . . the crowning act of the sacred liturgy." [27] As such, it is the highest expression of the virtue of religion of which we are capable.

Moreover, we may note that sacrifice is not essentially an interior but an exterior act. It presupposes interior dispositions, naturally. As Pius XII pointed out: "The chief element of divine worship must be interior." [28] Without this external, visible element, however, our inner dispositions are not, properly speaking, a "sacrifice." [29]

In addition, this act of sacrifice is accomplished purely and simply by *doing*. It was in this way that Christ offered Himself as a sacrificial Victim upon the cross; it is also in this way essentially that He continues to offer Himself upon the altar. As Pius XII explained: "It is because the priest places the divine Victim upon the altar that he offers It to God the Father as an oblation for the glory of the Blessed Trinity and for the good of the whole Church." [30]

This one immolative-oblation (or oblative-immolation) accomplishes the sacrifice of Christ and also the sacrifice of the Church. By the words of consecration, Christ is made present upon the altar and by that very act is offered up as an oblation for the glory of God.[31]

All of this is accomplished within the framework of a prayer—the Canon prayer especially—but, as de Broglie noted concerning the Last Supper: "The words of the eucharistic consecration were not addressed to God but to the Apostles; and they were aimed directly only at indicating for them the nature and the excellence of the food and drink which the act of Christ presented to them." [32] The same thing is true concerning the Mass. It is an act, both of Christ and the Church, accomplished essentially at the moment of consecration. The words which make Christ present also in-

[27] *Mediator Dei*, par. 66.
[28] *Ibid.*, par. 24.
[29] Cf. de Broglie, *Gregorianum, loc. cit.*, pp. 536 ff.
[30] *Mediator Dei*, par. 92.
[31] Cf. Paul Palmer, "The Lay Priesthood," *Theological Studies*, 8 (1947) 606; also de la Taille, *op. cit.*, Thesis XXVI, p. 234.
[32] de Broglie, *Gregorianum, loc. cit.*, p. 539.

dicate or make known the consecrative—immolative act which is taking place. Nothing more is needed to establish the offering of the Church than this. Even the Offertory could be accomplished by the simple act of "taking bread and wine." The Communion would be present by the consequent reception.

We can imagine, therefore, that it is possible for the Church under extreme circumstances, to permit the celebration of a Mass that would be just as simple as that, just as simple as the Last Supper. If this were done, the Mass would not in any way be less social, less the Sacrifice of the Church than it is with our present extended liturgy.

Thus, when we speak of the Mass-liturgy as the "whole sign," what we intend to say is that the Church, by these various prayers and external gestures, is giving fuller expression to that which is *de facto* taking place at the time of the consecration itself: at the very moment of the sacrificial act.

We do the same thing at Baptism. In cases of emergency, we baptize validly and licitly by reducing the rite to its essentials. It is not less a Baptism, however, even though we may later add the other ceremonies in order to call to mind the greater meaning of what actually took place in the brief ceremony. So also in regard to the Mass. The many prayers and ceremonies help enliven our faith, help us to understand the Sacrifice better, enable us to give greater expression to the tremendous mystery that is unfolding, and aid us in participating with a greater benefit. These become, as Vonier expresses it, "the extension and radiance of the divine sign." [33]

As such, however, these prayers and ceremonies are non-essential; the Sacrifice both of Christ and of the Church could be accomplished without them. Thus they cannot fashion or constitute, in itself, the Sacrifice of Christ or—what is the same thing—the Sacrifice of the Church.[34]

When we speak of the Mass-liturgy as the "whole sign," therefore, we mean the whole sign of the Sacrifice both of the Church and of Christ. If we wish to say that the Sacrifice of the Church begins

[33] Vonier, "La sacrifice des croyants," *loc. cit.*, p. 128. Cf. also our remarks on this point: "Liturgy as an Experience," *The Mass and Liturgical Reform* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1956), pp. 70-88; 166-169; 251-262.

[34] Cf. de Broglie, *Gregorianum, loc. cit.*, p. 559, note 10.

to take shape from the very start of the Mass, we must affirm this very same thing in regard to the Sacrifice of Christ.[35] We are one with Christ in all things, but never more so than in the relationship of our Sacrifice to His, for what the Church offers is nothing other than His sacrifice. To this we add nothing so much of our own that it is no longer His; all that we have to give as co-victims, and our very activity as co-offerers, flows from the grace of Christ. What we can add of a personal nature, both as individuals and as the entire Church, is the result of His Sacrifice. It proceeds from it, and thus *already* pertains to it. By becoming one with Christ, however, we are able to do what He does; He has placed His sacrifice in our hands. By freely co-operating with His grace, we become co-victims and co-offerers, and in this way is the fruit of the Cross applied to the souls of men; in this way does Christ accomplish in us what He accomplished on Calvary.

(To Be Concluded)

JOHN L. MURPHY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[35] As noted above (note 20), we would be anxious to avoid giving any impression that the "Sacrifice of the Church" is, in any sense, an entity distinct from the "Sacrifice of Christ." The extended Mass-liturgy gives fuller expression to the essential content of the Mass, but it does not of itself constitute the Sacrifice of the Church. The notion of a "full sign" cannot be so conceived that we think of a number of distinct and successive acts that go to make up the full sign, or of distinct sacrifices which are signified in different parts of the Mass-liturgy. The notion of a full sign is not to be understood as opposed to a "partial" sign, but rather as opposed to a less outwardly expressive sign. If a theologian states that the essence of the Mass rests in the Consecration, he is thereby also stating that the Consecration is the *full sign*. What is contained within this sacramental signification, however, is not as outwardly apparent as it may become in a more extended Mass-liturgy. In the Consecration, however, we must insist that everything essential to both the Sacrifice of Christ and the Sacrifice of the Church is actually present. In this more detailed Mass-liturgy, everything else assumes meaning because of the essential elements. Thus, in a way, the entire Mass is "sacrifice," just as the entire baptismal ceremony is baptism. This can also be affirmed of the Fore-Mass, but not in the sense that it might obscure the essential notes of Sacrifice, both in regard to the Church and to Christ.

MIRROR OF JUSTICE

Theologically, Mary's title, "Mirror of Justice," focuses sharply on her relationship to God. A brief examination of the profound truths underlying this phrase from the Litany of Loretto indicates the unique magnificence that is predicated of her. To deepen our grasp of its significance, we shall first consider what is meant by *justice* and how Mary can be said to reflect it. Next we shall see how this reflection is actually an extrinsic glorification of God due to a communication of His goodness. Lastly, we shall show how this communication operates in Mary herself and in her relation to others.

To call Mary a mirror of the cardinal virtue of justice would be accurate but hardly adequate. Fortunately, such a limitation is unnecessary. For the Jews, justice had a grander sound than it does for us. In fact, the Jewish mind viewed all mutual relationships in the light of justice even the religious one, though this obviously transcends the strictly legal sphere. To be a just man was an outstanding achievement implying "human behaviour in harmony with God's will, and well pleasing to him—uprightness of life, doing what is right in God's sight." [1]

Analogically, God is just. But there is a double reason for calling Him so: He possesses justice Himself and He imparts it to others. Creatures participate in the righteousness of God and through this sharing attain salvation. God's justice, blended as it is with His mercy, infinitely exceeds the justice of the courts, but the legal phraseology is apposite in showing that "the grace of God is not something arbitrary and capricious, but that it operates according to the principles of the holy Covenant and is in perfect harmony with His justice." [2]

Participation in the justice of God is achieved through union with Christ. Christ reflects the justice of God because as God He is the second Person of the Trinity, the image of the Father; and

[1] G. Quell and G. Shrenk, *Righteousness:* Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1951), p. 35.
[2] *Ibid.*, 45.

because as man, hypostatically united to this divine being, His actions are infinitely just. As St. Paul points out, Christ was made justice for us.[3] Mary shares in a special way in the life that He brought in abundance, because she was the one who generated this "Sun of justice." As the Church sings, *"Felix namque es, sacra Virgo Maria, et omni laude dignissima: quia ex te ortus est sol justitiae, Christus Deus noster."* [4]

This communication of the justice of God must be seen, to be fully apreciated, in the larger context of creation. In making creatures out of nothing God patterns them after the divine ideas, ways in which His divine goodness can be communicated to others. In creation as well as in the supernatural elevation of man, there is both participation in God's goodness and the manifestation of His perfections. This manifestation is the glorification of God, which is the intrinsic *finis operis* of all things made by Him, including Mary. However, since this glory is a finite thing, it cannot move the divine Will. Consequently, the sole *finis operantis*, the ultimate *finis qui* and the ultimate *finis operis* must be God Himself.

Nevertheless, though God could only be moved to act by His own infinite goodness, He chose out of love to communicate that goodness to creatures. In participating in that goodness, they manifest His perfections, they show His glory and His supreme justice. Since she is the greatest of creatures, Mary's participation is so full, that it is called a veritable reflection.

God's love for his creatures is so great that this extrinsic glory, when it is given consciously to God by rational creatures, is for their benefit rather than His. St. Thomas explains: "The reverence and honor that we show toward God is not for Himself, because of Himself He is filled with glory to which nothing can be added by a creature; but for us, since by reverencing and honoring God our minds are subjected to Him, and in this our perfection consists." [5] Mary, who most perfectly gives glory to God by her being and her actions, most perfectly manifests His perfections. Her sanctification and God's glorification are complementary. They show at its highest the mutual relationship meant by the word justice.

[3] *I Cor.* 1:30.
[4] Offertory, *Missale Romanum*, Maria in Sabbato post Nativitatem.
[5] St. Thomas, *S.Th.* II-II, q.81, a.7.

But to see Mary fully resplendent as a "mirror of justice," we must examine some facets of her life. All her beauty rests on the fact that she is the Mother of God, and necessarily a fitting Mother. To grasp the extent of God's communication to Mary, we consider her individually and socially.

Mary is full of grace and free of sin. Her fullness of the gifts of God is the most perfect source of her reflective beauty, but the very abundance of her prerogatives and privileges dazzle the viewer. For us, it is her freedom from sin that enables us to grasp more easily something of her loveliness. The most striking aspect of this liberation is found in her Immaculate Conception.

Not only in her avoidance of original sin, but even in her relationship to that law which subjected all the children of Adam to this culpable privation, does Mary's pre-eminence shine forth. Was she exempt from the law of original sin or merely protected from its application? At the minimum, one must hold to non-application. The reason would be that, as a descendant of Adam, she fell under the law and was thus proximately subject to the debt of original sin. However, if we use the distinction between person and nature, we conclude that although (due to her human nature) she was remotely subject to the law, she was not (due to her personal predestination) formally included under the law at all. In this way, even the shadow of subjection is removed from her justice which shines forth in utter brilliance.

Mary is in a state similar to that of original justice, though it is due to the *gratia Christi* rather than the *gratia Dei*. She has been fashioned in innocence and integrity: the one augmented by complete freedom from actual sin; the other stabilized by the radical absence of the *fomes peccati*. She has no ignorance or error in the intellect, no malice in the will, no concupiscence or weakness in the appetite. There are no "wounds" in her soul, to lessen the perfect response to the will of God.

Mary's greatest glory is in being the Mother of the God-man, but it is not her only one. For she is the Mother of the whole Christ, Head and members. It is as the Spiritual Mother of mankind that she reflects the justice of God in a special way. This maternity is constituted by the co-redemption. Her free consent to be the Mother of God established her formal co-operation in the

Redemption. She merits our salvation *de congruo*. Her merits and satisfactions were accepted by the Father to bring forgiveness and friendship to man. In restoring the order of justice, her role—though real—was secondary to Christ's. But it was real, even though not essential. And it was necessary, but only hypothetically so, since God freely willed that she should play a part in our salvation. As Pope Benedict XV said: "She together with Christ redeemed the human race." [6] Nevertheless, she adds nothing to the work of Christ; rather, she affords a new title by which man is redeemed. There was one redemption with two intentions, the preservative one by which Christ redeemed Mary and the liberative one by which Christ and Mary redeemed the rest of the human race. They are chronologically the same, though there is a priority in nature.

But even the co-redemption does not exhaust Mary's share in the justice of God. She not only helps win redemption, she dispenses it. She participates in both the objective and the subjective redemption of mankind. In applying the fruits of the redemption, she acts as Dispensatrix of graces. She is not the principal cause of grace, physical or moral; but she is the proximate moral cause as intercessor. She has an *omnipotentia supplex*. Her will, always in harmony with the Will of God, is always efficacious. She mirrors God's justice both in the gaining and the giving of grace.

When Mary is spoken of as Queen, it is in terms of those two functions. Her position as associate of Christ the King with whom she earned our salvation gives her a royal dignity, a legal preeminence, reflecting that of her Son's. Her duty in dispensing means that she is instrumental in giving the actual grace or light to know the law of God, the actual grace or strength to do the law of God, and the sanctifying grace which is the reward of that charity which is the fulfilling of the law. As Queen of heaven, she helps the restoration of all things in Christ, by enabling others to reflect His justice in their lives.

The title, "Mirror of Justice" is, then, most richly suggestive of the greatness of Mary. Through it we see how her soul doth magnify the Lord, because in her the righteousness of the Lord is made manifest, "For she is the brightness of the eternal light, and

[6] *A.A.S.*, Vol. 10, 1918, p. 182.

the unspotted mirror of God's majesty, and the image of His goodness." [7]

DAVID GRANFIELD, O.S.B.

St. Anselm's Priory
Washington, D. C.

[7] *Wisdom* 7:26.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for March, 1910 contributed by Fr. T. Slater, S.J., is entitled "Liberalism and Usury." The author relates that the "Liberals" of the eighteenth century, in their desire to reject the Church's basic principle that money is non-productive and hence that interest-taking (without an extrinsic title) is wrong, went to the other extreme and eliminated all laws against the demanding of interest on loans. Nowadays, however, Fr. Slater asserts, there seems to be a tendency among civil legislators to acknowledge the Church's doctrine, and laws are being made which forbid the exacting of interest beyond a reasonable extrinsic title. . . . Fr. S. Donovan, O.F.M., proposes the view that in certain circumstances the civil authority may sterilize mental defectives and degenerates, so that they may not procreate. He alleges as the reason the preponderance of the common good of society over the good of individual citizens. (This view can no longer he held, since it has been definitely rejected by Pope Pius XI in *Casti connubii.*) . . . Fr. J. Fryar, of England, describes the various functions of church bells in old England—the passing bell (when a parishioner was dying), the Advent bell (rung the evenings of Advent), the market bell, etc. . . . Fr. M. Martin, S.J., continues his series on the organization of the Roman curia with an article on the Apostolic Signature. . . . Fr. J. Sheahan comments on the words of St. Paul: "Have we not a right to have a sister-woman go about, as well as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?" (*I Cor.*, 9:4). Fr. Sheahan points out that the right to which the Apostle alludes is the right to sustenance for his helper (which, however, he did not take but earned himself). . . . Fr. W. Leen describes the organization and present situation of the Greek Orthodox Church. . . . Mr. G. Metlake continues his account of the reform of church vestments. . . . A correspondent objects to the bestowal of such honors as the dignity of papal knight or monsignor on Americans (as incompatible with the spirit of democracy in our land), and is answered by an anonymous writer. . . . We are told that the number of Catholics in the United States now exceeds fourteen million.

F. J. C.

THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND CANONICITY

All Catholic theologians recognize that their opinions must remain within the framework of the teaching of the Church. Actually, of course, this allows much freedom. Nevertheless, because of the unchanging nature of revealed and Catholic truth, we must recognize that there will necessarily be certain hypotheses that will have to be rejected as incompatible with revealed and Catholic faith. The relationship of a question with revealed truth is usually quite apparent when we are dealing directly with a dogmatic or moral problem. In other instances, however, there may be room for some confusion, particularly when the argumentation is concerned with the historic or literary method.

In line with this, we propose here to discuss at least in part such an historical question, namely the position of the Vatican Council in regard to the canonicity of Sacred Scripture.

If we turn to a study of the *Acta* of the Council, we find that the original schema of the Constitution on Catholic Faith referred to the question in these words: "First of all . . . we profess and teach that all Catholic revelation is contained in the written books of the Old and New Testaments, and in the unwritten traditions which have come down to us, having been received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or having been handed down by the apostles as though by hand, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit. . . . [These books] are not to be believed to be sacred and canonical for the reason that, having been written by human authority alone, they were placed in the canon of sacred scripture by the authority of the Church; nor only for the reason that they contain divine revelation without error; but because they were written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and are, therefore, divinely inspired scriptures which have God as their Author, and therefore they contain truly and properly the written word of God."[1]

In this first form, there is little concerning the precise notion of canonicity, at least not the clarity that will appear in the later

[1] Mansi, 50, col. 61: "Imprimis . . . profitemur et docemus integram catholicam revelationem contineri in libris scriptis tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, et sine scripto traditionibus quae ex ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis

discussions. Thus, in the reformed schema this same section was changed somewhat and made to read: "And so this supernatural revelation, according to the faith of the universal Church recently declared by the Holy Council of Trent, 'is contained entire in the books of the Old and New Testaments and in the unwritten traditions.' Indeed, these entire books, with all their parts, just as they are enumerated in the decree of this same Council and are found in the Latin Vulgate, are to be accepted as sacred and canonical. In truth, the Church does not consider them as sacred and canonical because they were approved by its authority, although composed by human industry alone; nor only because they contain revelation without error; but because, having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God as their Author, and as such were handed down to the Church *through the apostles.*"[2]

This form was discussed by the fathers at the Council. The relator for the Commission on Catholic Faith, Archbishop Simor, stated that nothing was proposed here regarding inspiration which had not already been proclaimed by Trent.[3]

Later in the discussion, Archbishop Khayyath objected to the wording of the last phrase of this paragraph, stating: "It is not certain, nor is it without doubt, and much less is it of faith that all of the sacred books were handed down *through the apostles* or *by*

---

acceptae, aut ab ipsis apostolis, Spiritu sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt . . . Sacri autem et canonici credendi sunt non quod humana tantum ope scripti, auctoritate tamen ecclesiae in canonem sacrarum scripturarum relati sint; neque propterea solum, quod divinam revelationem sine errore contineant; sed eo quod Spiritu sancto inspirante conscripti fuerunt ideoque sunt scripturae divinitus inspiratae quae habent auctorem Deum atque ita continent vere et proprie verbum Dei scriptum."

[2] Mansi, 51, col. 34: "Haec porro supernaturalis revelatio, secundum universalis ecclesiae fidem, a sancta Tridentina synodo novissime declaratam, 'integra continetur in libris tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, et sine scripto traditionibus.' Qui quidem libri integri, prout in ejusdem concilii decreto recensentur, et in vulgata latina editione habentur, cum omnibus suis partibus pro sacris et canonicis suscipiendi sunt. Eos vero ecclesia non propterea pro sacris et canonicis habet quod auctoritate sua approbati sunt, licet sola humana industria concinnati; aut ideo dumtaxat quod revelationem sine errore contineant; sed ideo quod Spiritu sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ecclesiae per apostolos traditi sunt."

[3] Mansi, 51, col. 47.

the apostles, because the discussion is about all of them [i.e., all the sacred books]."[4] As examples of this, he cited Mark, Luke and II Machabees. For this reason, the Archbishop proposed an emendation to the schema, rewording the last clause thus: "They are to be accepted as sacred and canonical . . . for the reason that, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God as their author and as such the Church receives and venerates them."[5] The reference to the apostles would thus be eliminated.

In the discussion concerning the proposed emendations, the relator for the Commission was Bishop Gasser. In regard to the present inquiry, we have his response to an earlier and similar proposal: "These things having [already] been said negatively regarding the notion of inspiration,[6] it is now stated positively what inspiration is, both as regards its internal mark, namely, that, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God as their Author; and then as regards the external mark, that they were handed down to the Church as such *through the apostles,* for as Augustine said: 'I would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Church moved me.' Therefore, this external mark must be present so that any book might be considered as inspired, and that we might be held to believe this by divine faith."[7]

Considering this response, it comes as somewhat of a surprise to find that Gasser suggests almost immediately after this that the Council accept the emendment proposed by Khayyath. His explanation, however, removes all confusion; he does not contradict himself:

[4] Mansi, 51, col. 162 ff.: "Non est certum, non est indubitatum, et multo minus de fide per apostolos vel ab apostolis traditos esse libros omnes sacros quia de omnibus sermo est."

[5] Mansi, 51, col. 266: ". . . sed propterea quod Spiritu sancto inspirante Deum habent auctorem atque ut tales ipsa ecclesia suscipit ac veneratur."

[6] I.e., against the opinion advanced by Lessius concerning subsequent approval as sufficient.

[7] Mansi, 51, col. 283 ff.: "His negative dictis de notione inspirationis jam positive dicitur quid sit inspiratio, et quidem quoad characterem internum, scilicet quod Spiritu sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem; et deinde quoad characterem externum quod ut tales ecclesiae per apostolos traditi sunt; nam ut et ait Augustinus jam dixit: 'Evangelio non crederem, nisi ecclesiae me moveret auctoritas.' Ergo character iste externus debet accedere, ut liber aliquis habeatur inspiratus, et ut fide divina hoc credere teneamur."

"The Deputation on Faith accepts this emendation [of Archbishop Khayyath] to a certain extent, in this, namely that where in the words of the schema it is said: 'And as such they were handed down to the Church through the apostles,' that these words 'through the apostles' be omitted; not, indeed, that, should we say 'as such they were handed down to the Church,' the words would have another meaning than if we say 'handed down through the apostles.' For in order that the Church can propose something to be believed by faith, [can propose] that a certain book is inspired, this knowledge, indeed, must not only be certain, but it must also be revealed. That it indeed be revealed, it must be found in the deposit of the Church. And that it be found in the deposit of the Church, it must have been deposited by Jesus Christ, by the apostles, etc. But that the words may nevertheless be a bit broader, the Deputation proposes that these last words of the schema be thus accepted by the General Congregation."[8]

This emendation was carried overwhelmingly in accordance with the explanation of the relator, Bishop Gasser. This is expressly noted in Mansi.[9]

In addition to this discussion, we find a further indication of the mind of the Council in the action of Bishop Ketteler after this section of the reformed schema was approved by the General Congregation. Ketteler felt that the Vatican Council was going beyond the definition of Trent when it proposed to define that the books of the Bible had to be handed down by the apostles to the Church. He thought that this question should not be defined without a further discussion of the matter, and he privately proposed a further emendment to this paragraph which would clearly have obviated

[8] Mansi, 51, col. 284 ff.: "Deputatio de fide hanc emendationem aliquatenus accipit, scilicet in eo ut in verbis schematis ubi dicitur: 'Atque ut tales ecclesiae per apostolos traditi sunt' ut verba ista 'per apostolos' omittantur, non quidem verba, si dicimus 'ecclesiae traditi qua tales' alium sensum fundant, quam si dicimus 'per apostolos traditi.' Nam ut ecclesia aliquid de fide credendum proponere possit, librum aliquem esse inspiratum, utique non solummodo debet esse haec scientia certa, sed debet etiam esse revelata; ut vero sit revelata, debet inveniri in deposito ecclesiae, et ut inveniatur in deposito ecclesiae, utique deponi debuit a Jesu Christo, ab apostolis, etc. Sed ut nihilominus verba aliquantulum latius pateant, Deputatio proponit verba ista ultima schematis sic esse a congregatione generali accipienda."

[9] Mansi, 51, col. 285.

Gasser's explanation.[10] In the later discussions, however, no mention is made of Ketteler's request, and nothing new was said concerning the matter.

Three weeks later, the emended paragraph of the reformed schema was the one that was defined. The only change worthy of note is that it had now become the second paragraph of the definitive constitution.

Considering these discussions within the Council, the question remains to be answered: Did the Vatican Council define that all Sacred Scripture had to exist before the end of the apostolic age?

It is not stated explicitly in the decree. On the other hand, it is apparent from the *Acta* that, in eliminating the words "through the apostles," the Council did not intend to give the impression that the canonical books came to the Church in any other fashion. As Gasser explained, the decree would have the same meaning whether these words were used or not. Apparently it was simply deemed best to phrase it in a somewhat broader fashion.

The first section of the decree, however, repeats the words of Trent, in which revelation is described as coming from the apostles, who had either received it from Christ Himself or under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.[11] From these words, viewed in the light of these discussions, we may conclude that it is at least *implicitly* stated in the decree that all the Sacred Scriptures had to exist before the end of the apostolic age. The *Acta* indicate clearly enough that this was the thought of the Fathers of the Vatican Council. This was the mind of Gasser in explaining the position of the Deputation of Faith; the agreement of the entire body is apparent in the acceptance of the paragraph, following the explanation of Gasser. Bishop Ketteler also agreed that this was the meaning of the decree; otherwise, he would not have considered another emendment that would further delimit the meaning.

Nevertheless, no further change was made, and the final form of the Constitution on Faith appeared as had been decided. There is nothing in the records of the Council that indicates that any less restrictive interpretation was put on the words between April 4th and April 24th, 1870, allowing one to extend this notion beyond

[10] Mansi, 51, col. 352 f.
[11] Denz. 1787.

the time of the apostles. We may conclude, therefore, that whatever Trent may have defined about the notion of canonicity, it seems that the Vatican Council was more clear in its intent, and definitely included the notion of the apostolic handing-down of the canonical books in its decree.

JOHN J. O'ROURKE

Saint Charles Seminary
Overbrook, Philadelphia, Pa.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

THE PRIEST AND THE ASCETICAL CULTIVATION OF THE FAITH

Faith, according to the Vatican Council's constitution *Dei Filius,* is "the supernatural virtue by which, with the inspiration and the aid of God's grace, we believe those things revealed by Him to be true, not because of the intrinsic truth of these things seen in the natural light of human reason, but because of the authority of God Himself, who can neither be deceived nor deceive, revealing them." [1]

This faith, of course, is necessary for all men. Objectively all men are bound to accept what God Himself has indicated as His own message by the very force of the obligation of religion itself. Through the exercise of the virtue of religion we pay to God the debt of acknowledgment and gratitude which we most certainly and obviously owe to God by reason of His supreme excellence and by reason of our complete dependence upon Him. Included in that debt of acknowledgment due to God is the certain acceptance as true of the message He has conveyed to us. As the *Dei Filius* puts it: "Since the entire man depends upon God as upon his Creator and Lord, and since created reason is totally subject to uncreated Truth, we are bound to give, by faith, full submission of intellect and will to God revealing." [2]

It is important to note that the Council uses the expression *"full* submission." The acknowledgment we give to the living, infinite, and eternal God by accepting His supernatural teaching as true is not meant to be a half-hearted affair.

Furthermore the faith is necessary by reason of the fact that it is "the beginning of human salvation." Unless a man departs from this life in the possession of the true divine faith, he will never attain to the Beatific Vision. And, in this life, neither the life of sanctifying grace nor any of the other supernatural and infused virtues can exist apart from the faith.

The intensity or the perfection of the supernatural life itself is, in every man in the state of grace, directly proportionate to the intensity of the faith which illumines and gives meaning to that

[1] *Denz.,* 1789.
[2] *Ibid.*

life. It is clearly impossible to have a genuinely powerful charity, and to have, at the same time, a relatively remiss faith.

Basically the tremendous value of divine faith, and its complete influence in the spiritual life here in this world are reasons why every man who is privileged to possess this virtue is obligated to work for the protection and the cultivation of the faith in his own soul. The ascetical cultivation of the virtue of faith is an exigency of the Christian life itself. A failure to appreciate and to treasure the gift of faith, and an unwillingness to strive to nourish and to develop the faith within oneself can only be indicative of lamentable spiritual infirmity.

The efforts which the Christian is meant to make for the protection and the cultivation of his faith are described in the course of ascetical theology. Basically these efforts fall into two categories. The man who seeks to perfect and intensify his faith should prayerfully make explicit acts of this virtue and should likewise take action against those factors in his life or his environment which are incompatible with or at least inimical to his faith.

For the Catholic priest, however, the section of ascetical theology which deals with the protection and the cultivation of divine faith has a special meaning and urgency. His need of a firm, enlightened, and active faith is particularly immediate and pressing. Furthermore the procedures for the protection and the perfecting of the faith which are pointed out in Catholic ascetical theology are necessary for him, not only for the advancement and the appreciation of his spiritual life, but for the very meaning and the success of his professional career.

In this way the priest's need for an active and lively faith is more intense and more immediate that that of lay Catholics. The true meaning and the orientation of the priest's entire life are recognizable only in the light of divine faith. If the Catholic attorney or postal clerk should fail to see their daily work in terms of God's revealed teachings, they will of course lose the great treasure of divine grace and consolation. But the practice of the law courts and the movement of the mail have naturally ascertainable meanings and principles, while, on the other hand, the offering of the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, and the preaching of Catholic doctrine have no real merely naturally ascertainable significance at all.

The priest, whose life revolves around such activities, is in a position in which he must definitely advert to what God has taught about the Mass, and the sacraments, and about the salutary doctrine of Christ, if his sacerdotal activity is going to have any meaning at all for him. If, which God forbid, any priest should perform the works of the priesthood without making the effort to evaluate this activity in the light of the faith, his sacerdotal life is doomed to failure and frustration. He will be blindly performing acts of indescribable dignity and effectiveness without ever realizing the real significance of these acts.

And, if his faith be weak and remiss, his appreciation of his own sacerdotal life will necessarily be imperfect and inadequate. One can never derive a full and vital appreciation of priestly activity from a faith that is other than powerful and influential.

Particularly in the earlier stages of the Christian life, the development and the strengthening of any virtue demands serious effort. This is true with reference to the faith just as much as with reference to any other infused virtue. And it is just as true for the priest as it is for the layman. If the priest is to have the high intensity of faith which is requisite for the success of his priesthood and for the attainment of his eternal goal, he must expend strenuous and continuing effort for the development of the virtue of the faith.

In the first place, it is important that he develop this theological virtue by taking positive action. He must make an explicit act of faith whenever this act is called for by the needs of his own spiritual life or by the nature of the priestly work he is called upon to perform. It should be quite obvious that the ordinary day of the average priest furnishes a good many occasions when such an act of faith is necessary.

The life of the priest centers around the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice. And each individual Mass, particularly each individual act of consecration, demands on the part of the celebrant an explicit recognition of the supernaturally revealed truth about the Mass and about the consecration. That, of course, is the main reason for the preparation we must make before Mass. The requisite act of faith automatically carries with it the desire to offer thanks to God for the privilege of having been granted the grace to offer the sacrifice. And, furthermore, it insures the necessary reverence in the saying of the Mass itself.

In exactly the same way an explicit act of faith is called for each time that the priest is privileged to instruct the people of God. His efforts are doomed to failure unless he takes explicit cognizance of the fact that he is being privileged to co-operate in the doctrinal mission of the apostolic college itself. He cannot do his work properly unless he is aware that he is being privileged to act in the capacity of an ambassador of Jesus Christ.

The priest certainly does not suffer from any lack of occasions which demand on his own part a sincere and prayerful act of divine faith. He is thus in a uniquely fortunate position with reference to the positive element in the ascetical development of the supernatural virtue of faith. But there is also a negative element or factor to be considered. In order to work for the strengthening of the faith, the priest is bound to react against whatever may militate against the purity and the certitude of the faith within him. The ascetical teachings of the Catholic Church demand not merely that our faith be exercised and nourished. They also require that it be protected.

On this point it is to be noted that there exists among Catholics, and especially within the priesthood itself, an almost superstitious tendency to imagine that, short of completely and diabolically malicious activity on the part of the faithful, the virtue of faith itself is immune to serious harm. It is of course true that the faith is not lost by any mortal sin except one which is directed against the faith itself. Yet, at the same time, it remains a fact that the faith, like every other virtue we possess during our lives in this world, is fragile and subject to harm. The faith itself can only be lost by the mortal sins of heresy and apostasy. Yet the effectiveness of the faith in an individual life can definitely be impaired by adoption of attitudes which are essentially inimical to the life of the faith.

The case of the infused moral virtue of justice is somewhat similar. The man who possesses this infused moral virtue is disposed to give to others what is due to them. He commits a mortal sin directly against justice when he knowingly violates the rights of another in some serious degree.

Yet it is possible for a man in the state of grace, possessing the infused moral virtue of justice, to retain that virtue even while he is committing venial sins against it. A petty theft is not in itself sufficient to ruin and to destroy the virtue of justice within the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

man who is committing these venial sins. Yet a series of these venial sins will inevitably bring about within this man a disposition which is at odds with the virtue of justice. As a result of these venial sins the man who commits them loses something of the force and the efficacy of the virtue itself.

In somewhat the same way, it is unfortunately possible for a man, while retaining the supernatural virtue of divine faith, to build up within himself dispositions which are hostile to this virtue. Such dispositions arise from a respect for or a certain complacency with utterances or attitudes which are themselves incompatible with the divine truth of the faith. In his ascetical care of this virtue, it is definitely the business of the priest to see to it that he allows no such dispositions to arise within himself.

In our own day, considerable effort is required for the prevention or the eradication of these dispositions. Ultimately these attitudes which are hostile to the faith are prevented and eradicated only by prayerful and strenuous labor for the complete sincerity of our Catholic belief. They cannot coexist with a determination "to give, by faith, *full* submission of intellect and will to God revealing."

Since the early days of Modernism, these dispositions harmful to the faith have tended to advance under cover of learning. This has come about in two distinct ways. Sometimes teachings or attitudes inimical to Our Lord's teaching have been more or less cleverly set forth as the products of scientific study or research. And, at other times, gullible Catholics have been lured into imagining that a higher knowledge of the Catholic truth itself is in some way damaging to the faith of an ordinary member of the Church.

The priests of our own day must be continually on their guard against the first of these tendencies. All too frequently they are encouraged to believe that in some way or another, what is proposed as Catholic doctrine to the faithful within the Catholic Church fails to stand up under the test of genuine scientific investigation. They are invited to imagine that at least some of the teachings of the Catholic Church are in need of restatement or recasting to such an extent that they will no longer be understood in the sense in which the Church has hitherto understood and taught them.

The men who strive thus to affect the faith of the Catholic priests speak with all the confidence and the self-assurance of genuine

scholars. They encourage and attract attention to each other, in such a way that the unwary person is easily beguiled into fancying that they really speak with the authority and in the name of true science and learning. Their doctrinal activity constitutes a hazard to the existence, or at least to the well-being, of the virtue of divine faith in those with whom they come in contact.

A properly ascetical care for the virtue of faith requires that the priest reject any assertions opposed to the divine teaching of the Church immediately and automatically. The priest knows what the content of the divine revelation really is. He is in a position to recognize any proposition which is directly contradictory to that revelation or even incompatible with it. Regard for his faith and loyalty to his Divine Teacher require that he should at once repudiate as untrue any assertion opposed to the divinely revealed message. If he is to act as a loyal ambassador of Jesus Christ, he must make his own this teaching of the *Dei Filius:*

> Although actually faith is above reason, there can still never be any true opposition between faith and reason: since the same God who reveals the mysteries and infuses the faith has conferred the light of reason upon the human soul. But God could never deny Himself, nor can the truth ever contradict the truth. The empty appearance of such contradiction most frequently arises because either the dogmas of the faith have not been understood and exposed according to the mind of the Church or the proposition of opinions is taken for the statement of reason. Therefore we define that every assertion contrary to the truth of enlightened faith is entirely false.[3]

Such an attitude is alone consonant with the exigencies of divine faith in the priest. If a man genuinely accepts as certain and on the authority of God the teaching which the Church proposes to him as Catholic dogma, he is not going to be stampeded into accepting as true any proposition contradictory to or incompatible with that teaching, even when that proposition is represented as the fruit of modern science. The loyal and intelligent Catholic, faithful to the teachings of the Vatican Council, is always aware of the fact that teachings really opposed to the dogmas of the Catholic faith are not true, and are definitely not supported by authentic scientific evidence.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1797.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Of course the priest, in pursuing his ascetical cultivation of the faith, must still take cognizance of the directives contained in Pius IX's letter *Tuas libenter,* addressed to the Archbishop of Munich on Dec. 21, 1863.

> While We give them [the members of a Congress of Catholic intellectuals gathered at Munich a short time before] due praise because they have professed the truth which necessarily arises from the obligation of the Catholic faith, We wish to persuade Ourselves that they have not wanted to restrict the obligation by which Catholic teachers and writers are completely bound only to those things which are proposed by the infallible judgment of the Church as dogmas of the faith which are to be believed by all. And We also persuade Ourselves that they have not wished to declare that the perfect adherence to revealed truths, which they have recognized as completely necessary for the attainment of the true advance of the sciences and for the confutation of errors, can be obtained if faith and submission *(obsequium)* be given only to dogmas expressly defined by the Church. For, even if one should speak only of that subjection which is to be given in the act of faith, still that [subjection] must not be restricted to those things which have been defined in the express decrees of the ecumenical councils or of the Roman Pontiffs, or of this See, but it must also be extended to those things which are proposed *(traduntur)* as divinely revealed by the ordinary *magisterium* of the entire Church dispersed throughout the world, and which consequently are accepted as pertaining to the faith by the Catholic theologians with universal and constant agreement.
>
> But when one is dealing with that subjection to which all Catholics who are engaged in scientific inquiry are bound in conscience, so that, by their writings, they may bring new benefits to the Church, on this point the men of that same assembly ought to recognize the fact that it is not enough for Catholic savants to receive and venerate the abovementioned dogmas of the Church, but that it is also necessary that they submit themselves to the doctrinal decisions which are set forth by the Pontifical Congregations as well as to those points of doctrine which are held by the common and constant consent of Catholics as theological truths and conclusions which are so certain that, even though the opinions opposed to these points of doctrine cannot be designated as heretical, they still deserve some other theological censure.[4]

---

[4] *Ibid.,* 1683 f.

In other words, the vigor and the well being of the virtue of faith require that the man who is privileged to possess this virtue accept not only those truths which are proposed as dogmas, as truths which are to be received with the assent of divine faith itself, but also all the teaching set forth authoritatively by the Church, even when the truth so proposed is not directly guaranteed by the Church's charism of infallibility. The ascetical cultivation of the priestly virtue of faith must proceed along these lines, and in conformity with this norm.

Actually the "difficulties" against which the priest must struggle in his task of strengthening and perfecting his faith stem, in our own time at least, chiefly from a tendency towards gullibility. The priest may occasionally be *told* that there is a reason for accepting something which is incompatible with Catholic doctrine, but he will never actually be shown conclusive *evidence* which would necessitate a repudiation of this doctrine. Invariably the only evidence forthcoming in these "difficulties" against the faith and against Catholic doctrine is evidence which "they" are supposed to have discovered. The Catholic does not encounter real evidence which is meaningful to him and which militates against the truth of the faith.

Thus the ascetical cultivation of the theological virtue of faith demands on the part of the believer a realistic attitude with reference to sources which are supposed to be scientific or scholarly, but which are obviously hostile to the teaching of the Catholic Church. The Catholic who is prone to offer servile adulation to everything that is represented as the fruit of scholarship in non-Catholic or anti-Catholic circles is, by his very attitude, endangering the force and the perfection of his own faith, and thus of his own spiritual life. The man who is certain, on the authority of God Himself, that what God has revealed is true, is not in a position to be deluded into imagining that statements incompatible with the divine teaching are backed by any genuine evidence. The tragedy of Modernism in the twentieth century has centered around the fact that men who should have known better were led to imagine that teachings incompatible with Catholic faith and Catholic doctrine were legitimate scientific conclusions.

There was one other obstacle which Modernism placed in the way of a strong and influential Catholic faith. That was the illu-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

sion that, in some way or another, a more profound insight into Catholic truth would or could undermine the faith of the ordinary Catholic. Interestingly enough, a very recent book has encouraged this fallacy.

> It would be tragic for the secondary schoolteacher to repeat the pathetic experiment of Baron Friedrich von Hügel who, as a religious philosopher is without peer in the twentieth century, but who, as a pedagogue, was sadly deficient, at least as evidenced by his attempt to introduce his immature daughter to religious and historical truths that her tender emotional condition could not support. Her consequent spiritual collapse offers a melancholy reminder of the dangers of entering upon the intellectual engagement before the completion of a long and serious moral novitiate.[5]

Of course, in reality there is no thirty-third degree in Catholicism. There is no secret information available only to the most advanced. There are no "religious and historical truths" which would tend to shake the faith of the instructed Catholic.

It is a matter of record that Von Hügel's religious tutoring of his daughter did result in the rejection of the Catholic faith by the young girl. But it is no less a matter of record that the great mass of those Catholics who placed themselves under the influence of the old Modernist ended up by repudiating the faith. What influenced the unfortunate priests and the equally unfortunate girl to abandon the faith was definitely not some body of truth for which they were not prepared, but a mass of errors which Von Hügel deluded all of them into accepting as religious and historical truth.[6] Genuine truth, in the field of religion or in the field of history, will never influence any man to repudiate what he believes as a Catholic on the authority of God revealing.

The ascetical development of the divine faith will necessarily involve the repudiation of the fancy that religious or historical truth can be harmful to the faith. It will likewise demand a proper evaluation of the writers and writings who have worked against Catholic truth. It is also a matter of record that, during the earlier

[5] Justus George Lawler, in *The Catholic Dimension in Higher Education* (Westminsher, Md.: The Newman Press, 1959), pp. 233 f.

[6] Cf. Fenton, "Von Hügel and Ecclesiastical Authority," and "Von Hügel and his Spiritual Direction," in *AER*, CXXXIII, 1, 2 (July, August, 1955), 35-52; 109-27.

stages of the Modernist crisis, far more harm was done to the faith of Catholics by men who piously professed acceptance of the Church's teaching, but who, at the same time, bitterly opposed all of those who actually contradicted the Modernist writers, than was done by the Modernists themselves. The man who works for the advancement and the strengthening of the faith within him definitely cannot be an anti-anti-Modernist.

Obviously, the circumstances of our time demand that our Catholic priests work diligently and strenuously towards the strengthening of their faith. They may be assured that God will reward such efforts. In the attainment of their goal they will find the success and the satisfaction that go to crown the priestly spiritual life.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Answers to Questions

THE AMBRY

Question: Where is an ambry to be placed? In the sacristy? In the sanctuary? Are there any specifications to be observed?

Answer: Matters Liturgical, N. 110, *m* and *n* (1959 ed.) furnishes abundant information on the ambry: "The ambry for the sacred oils may be made of wood or metal or marble. If it is of marble or metal, the interior is generally covered with cedar or some similar wood as a protection against dampness. It is also customary and fitting to line the interior with silk, violet in color if only the Oil of the Sick is kept in the ambry, but otherwise white or green. The door of the ambry should be of metal preferably and provided with strong lock and hinges. An inscription like *Oleum Infirmorum* or *Olea Sacra* may be engraved or otherwise written on or above the door, depending on whether only the Oil of the Sick or other sacred oils also are kept inside. The ambry should be within reach of one standing on the floor. . . . The ambry for the sacred oils is ordinarily attached to or set into the wall of the sanctuary on the Gospel or the Epistle side (S.R.C. 1260). But the ambry may also be located in the sacristy, while the Oil of Catechumens and the Holy Chrism used in Baptism may even be placed in the ambry located in the baptistery. These matters, however, should be decided, not merely on the basis of one's personal convenience, but first and foremost on the basis of the great reverence due to the sacred oils. Nothing but the sacred oils may be kept in the ambry, except when the baptistry ambry is used as just noted, in which case oils may be kept with the salt, the candle, and the like."

TABERNACLE KEY

Question: Is there a special directive regarding custody of the tabernacle key beyond the words of the canon (1269, 4) in the Code of Canon Law? If there is a special directive from the Holy See, what does it specify? Would placing the tabernacle key in the ambry, if the ambry were erected in the sacristy, comply with the requirements?

Answer: An Instruction on the Careful Custody of the Most Blessed Eucharist was issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments on May 26, 1938. In this document, which can be seen in translation in Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest,* 2, pp. 377 ff., we find the following discussion of the tabernacle key: *"The key of the tabernacle must be most carefully guarded by a priest.* All the precautions already mentioned will be useless unless attention be given to the principal one, namely, that the key of the tabernacle be carefully guarded, as provided in canon 1269, 4, which specifies that this is a *grave obligation in conscience* on the priest to whom its care is entrusted. In order that the rector of the church may fulfill this obligation of *most careful custody,* prescribed by the canon, he is strictly enjoined never to leave the tabernacle key on the altar table or in the lock of the tabernacle door, not even during morning hours when divine services are held at the altar of the Blessed Sacrament and Holy Communion is distributed, especially if this altar is not in a conspicuous place. Rather, after these services the key should either be kept by the rector in his house or carried about on his person, with precautions against losing it, or it should be deposited in the sacristy, but in a secure and secret place to be locked with another key which the rector should keep as above stated.

"Let priests who have charge of the Blessed Sacrament seriously reflect that the duty of very careful custody of the key to the tabernacle is a grave one, as is perfectly clear both from the purpose and from the words of the law. The priest who ordinarily and *per se* has the right and duty to take charge of the key is the rector of the church or oratory. In case he goes away, he may and should give the charge to another priest for the duration of his absence. If he is keeping the key in the sacristy under another lock, he should give this second key to the sacristan for the time of his absence if the tabernacle key is likely to be needed—a practice which is manifestly confirmed by general usage. In the case of a parish church the key is to be kept by the pastor. . . .

"Some special observations are to be made about the custody of the tabernacle key in churches of nuns or religious women and in pious or religious houses of women. First of all, in view of the provision of canon 1267, which, revoking all contrary privileges, forbids that the Blessed Sacrament be kept either in a religious or

pious house elsewhere than in the church or principal oratory, or by nuns inside the choir or enclosure of the monastery, it must be deeply impressed on the minds of Ordinaries, and strictly observed, that *the key of the tabernacle is not to be kept within the wall of a monastery* (cf. reply of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 2 May 1878, ad VI; decr. n. 3448; and Gasparri, *De Sanctissima Eucharistia*, 266, n. 998). In future, therefore, it should be kept in the sacristy so as to be at hand when needed, and when the sacred functions in the church are finished, and especially at night, it should be deposited in a safe, strong, and secret place, and locked with two keys, of which one should be kept by the Superioress of the community, either personally or through another, and the other by one of the nuns, for example the sacristan, so that the concurrence of the two is necessary in order to open the place where the key is kept. . . .

"As regards oratories of a seminary and ecclesiastical college, a school for the religious instruction and training of the young of either sex, a hospital or other such institution, which may have the faculty of keeping the Blessed Sacrament, the tabernacle key is to be kept in each case by the rector or head of the institution, if he is a priest, otherwise by the spiritual director or chaplain who has charge of the regular celebration of Mass and of sacred functions, and he must take good care that it does not fall into other hands."

From what has been said in answer to the previous question it can be seen that the ambry is not a proper place for the tabernacle key.

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

THE REASON FOR JOINING THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Question: What is to be said of stating as the first reason for joining the Catholic Church "because it is much easier to save your soul in the Catholic Church"?

Answer: It is correct to say that it would be easier to save one's soul as a member of the Catholic Church than as a non-member, when the non-member is joined to the Church by good faith and implicit desire. Pope Pius XII, in his Encyclical *Mystici corporis*,

brought out this point when he said of such persons: "For even though unsuspectingly they are related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in desire and resolution, they still remain deprived of so many precious gifts and helps from heaven which one can enjoy only in the Catholic Church." But to propose this as objectively the main motive for joining the Church is surely a distortion of doctrine. When the chief motive for using a means to an end is the fact that it makes the attainment of the end easier, a person is usually not bound to make use of this means—it is only a matter of counsel. The basic reason for joining the Catholic Church is the fact that the Church is a *necessary* means to salvation—necessary by necessity of precept and of means. This should always be proposed as the first reason why a non-Catholic should join the Catholic Church.

CHEATING IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Question: It seems that much cheating is going on in schools and colleges. The *Saturday Evening Post* for Jan. 9, 1960, contained a startling article on the prevalence of this practice in American educational institutions. Apparently, some young persons see no harm in cheating. What is to be said of the morality of this mode of conduct? Is it a sin, and if so, against which commandment? What of the gravity of a sin that may be committed by cheating?

Answer: Cheating in school is a sin against the *eighth* commandment. In other words, it is a lie. The pupil who hands in an examination paper asserts implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) that he has used no other help than those that are permitted, such as (in some instances) a dictionary. He is understood to state that he has made no use of such forbidden helps as hidden notes, secret communication with the others who are taking the examination, etc. Hence, if he has made use of prohibited help, his submitting of the paper is a lie in action.

Cheating may also be a sin against the *seventh* commandment, a sin of injustice. For example, if a pupil through cheating wins a valuable prize or a cherished honor, he is violating commutative justice, equivalent to theft, against the person whose honest efforts actually entitled him to the prize or honor. The cheat may also

violate charity and legal justice—that is, if through his dishonest methods he manages to pass an examination that wins for him a post of responsibility for which he is actually incompetent. This would be true of a student, who by cheating gained admission to the medical profession where his ineptitude may do much harm. This would also be applicable to the law student, and above all to the candidate for the priesthood, who would thus unjustly gain admission to their respective professions.

Cheating in a case where no matter of great importance would depend on the examination would be a venial sin. But when a valuable prize or an honor of great distinction was thus won, or when the falsification may be seriously harmful to society, the cheat would be guilty of mortal sin.

LACK OF REVERENCE AMONG THE LAITY

Question: It seems that it is becoming quite common for members of the laity to refer to their priests either by their first name or by their family name without prefixing "Father." Indeed, reference to bishops and cardinals in this way is not uncommon. Will you please comment on this custom?

Answer: My own experience confirms the statements of the questioner. Many Catholics nowadays refer to priests and even to bishops and cardinals by their surnames (or their first names) without any indication of reverence. It would seem that this custom is more common among the "liberal" Catholics. They seem to think that it is unbecoming for persons of their learning and broadmindedness to follow the custom of the simple, respectful Catholics who never speak of a priest or bishop without prefixing "Father" or "Bishop." Indeed good parents of this latter type speak even of their priestly son as "Father Joe."

I do not believe that there is any proof of outstanding intelligence or culture in the custom of dropping "Father" or "Bishop." If anything, I regard it as a mark of immaturity, such as we find in a little boy who wants to prove that he is a great fellow by using profane language in the presence of other boys. On the other hand, I do not regard it as a sin, as long as no insult is intended. But it betokens a failure to realize in a practical way the dignity of the priest or bishop—the dignity which God in His goodness

has bestowed on him by granting him a share in the priesthood of Jesus Christ.

Perhaps one reason for this unfortunate habit on the part of the laity is the fact that some priests are careless in this matter. In the presence of the laity a priest should never speak to or about a brother priest without the prefix "Father." They may refer to him as Father Tom or Father Joe, but never as mere Tom or Joe or Murphy. If this latter usage is adopted by a priest in the hearing of lay listeners, they may easily begin to imitate him. And a priest should never allow himself to be addressed by a lay person without the title of "Father" unless the person is a near member of his family or a boyhood friend.

CONFIRMATION OF A RETARDED CHILD

Question: May a child who is so mentally retarded that it can never reach the age of reason be confirmed? If so, may it be confirmed as soon as its affliction is recognized— even though the child is only seven or eight years old?

Answer: This question was submitted by a grieving mother, one of whose children was of the type she describes—a child who evidently would never reach the use of reason. She wished to have the little one confirmed at the age of seven, when its mental disability was definitely recognized; but her request was refused, and she was told that the child must wait for Confirmation until it reached the age usual for Confirmation in that diocese. The child died suddenly a few weeks later.

The answer to this question is explicitly given by Suarez, who says: "It must be held that such mental defectives *(perpetuo amentes)* are not to be deprived of this sacrament (Confirmation). Indeed, in their case it is not to be deferred, as in the case of infants, because there is no expectation of a condition in which they can be better disposed. For infants are not deprived of this sacrament, but it is merely delayed for them, so that a more suitable time will be awaited. But these persons (perpetually deprived of the use of reason) would either have to be entirely deprived (of the sacrament), which does not seem either expedient or reasonable or, if they are not to be deprived of it, there is no reason for delay-

ing it. Hence, I would say that bishops must confirm such mental defectives, unless some grave and extraordinary cause prevents it" (*De Confirmatione*, Disp. XXXV, s. II, n. 5).

It might be asked if a pastor could confirm such a child within the limits of his parish, by virtue of the concession granted to pastors in 1946 (the use of which began in 1947). The answer is that he may not do so, unless the child is in danger of death. On the other hand, a bishop, especially in a large diocese, would not be obliged to go to the homes of retarded children in order to administer the sacrament of Confirmation, because this would require too much time. But if such a child is brought to church at the time of a general Confirmation (and perhaps kept in the sacristy), it could surely be given the wonderful sacrament of the Holy Spirit—even though it has so low a mentality that it could never be given Holy Communion, and is at present below the usual age for Confirmation. Such children often die unexpectedly, and it is a great source of consolation for the parents of such a child to realize that he will enjoy greater bliss and glory for all eternity because he departed this life enriched with the character and the grace of Confirmation.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

JOHN WESLEY AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, by John M. Todd. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958. Pp. 195. $3.00.

The purpose of this book is "to see objectively whether the doctrines [Wesley] preached were the same as traditional Catholic doctrine," and "to exonerate Wesley from any substantial doctrinal deviations." The author, a Catholic layman, inspired apparently by Père Bouyer's scholarly study of the Catholic tendencies of Luther and Calvin *(The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism),* assembles in 195 pages considerable fact and more opinion in an effort to support the determined view that John Wesley, founder of Methodism, was not only substantially Catholic in all his teaching, but that he was a mystic whose spiritual struggle, heroic virtue, and lofty doctrine make him comparable to St. John of the Cross.

To be sure, there is much in the life and teaching of Wesley, and in the reaction of his contemporaries to him that might lead one to regard this predecessor of the Oxford Movement as a man of remarkable, if unwitting, Catholic instincts and inclinations. And perhaps in another time, or in other circumstances, Wesley might have discovered and been drawn to the Catholic Church. Monsignor Knox, whose incomparably authoritative and brilliant work Mr. Todd dismisses rather airily, suggests casually that had Wesley not met the Moravians on the ship crossing the Atlantic, he would have avoided the one great distraction which possibly kept him from a quest which might have brought him at last to Rome.

However, the facts are that Wesley did live in the eighteenth century, that his contact with the Church and with Catholics was greatly limited, and that his religious background, his personal development, and his influence as the founder of Methodism (which is the fruit by which he must be judged) were entirely Protestant.

Mr. Todd has presented some of the well known facts about Wesley: his remarkable avoidance of Calvinistic pre-destination; his hesitancy to rely entirely on "feeling" and "assurance" in the matter of salvation; his devotion and attachment to the Established Church, its Thirty Nine Articles and its sacramental life, and his frequent use of Catholic spiritual authors. But in his anxious effort to prepare Wesley's writings, as it were, for a hypothetical *Nihil Obstat,* Todd seems to compromise his own orthodoxy as a Catholic writer. His discussion of

Wesley's views on the eucharist, and of his own views of *"extra ecclesiam nulla salus"* are a case in point.

Since the appearance of Father Maximin Piette's *John Wesley In the Evolution of Protestantism* in 1937, interest in Wesley's Catholic tendencies has grown significantly, to the advantage of both Catholic and Protestant scholarship. But it is a far cry from Father Piette's sympathetic but hypothetical comparison of Wesley with St. Francis of Assisi, to Todd's wholly uncritical judgments concerning the orthodoxy and sanctity of Wesley. Wesley was familiar with the writings of St. John of the Cross. He required his circuit riders to include these works in their "Christian Library" (along with five other Catholic authors); but this fact hardly seems to justify the view that Wesley's second disappointment in love was in reality an experience of the "dark night of the soul."

One argument on which Mr. Todd relies heavily to establish Wesley's Catholic view of the "Church" is his staunch and literal acceptance of the Thirty Nine Articles. But the author seems to forget that eight of these articles were framed precisely as anti-Catholic measures. Therefore, to equate Anglican loyalty with Catholic inevitability, especially in the 18th century, is unreasonable.

The author's hope, in writing on Wesley, is to bring Methodists to a better appreciation of their own founder, especially of his Catholic instinct and wisdom. But this laudable purpose is defeated by his insistence that Wesley not only tended toward Catholicism, but that he actually achieved it. Newman saw in Wesley "the suggestion of the supernatural qualities of a Catholic saint." John Todd demands that history speak not by suggestion but far more plainly in this regard.

OLIN J. MURDICK

FINDING GOD IN ALL THINGS. Essays in Ignatian Spirituality Selected from *Christus*. Translated by William J. Young, S.J. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1958. Pp. ix + 276. $2.75.

Selected from *Christus*, a French Jesuit periodical, these seventeen essays on Ignatian spirituality (translated by Fr. William Young, S.J.) form the newest in the series of *The Library of Living Catholic Thought*. Intellectual in tone and uncompromising in the description of perfection ("it is good to know the goal, the better to know the road") these essays present an ordered study of certain principles basic to the spirituality of St. Ignatius. The authors show a threefold preoccupation: an effort to throw light on the spiritual experience of Ignatius (the saint was no mere theorist); an effort to trace the

scriptural and traditional bases of his teaching; an effort to show the precise bearing of Ignatian spirituality on the apostolic life.

An idea of the matters treated in this book can be gathered from a recital of the five captions under which these dense pages have been grouped: God, His Glory, Love and Service; Christ and His Mother; The Problem of Prayer and Action; The Discernment of Spirits; Characteristic Ignatian Virtues.

It would be impossible here to take individual notice of the many good things in this book. It can be confidently expected that these essays will open new perspectives even to readers who are already acquainted with St. Ignatius and his Exercises. A notable achievement, in one man's opinion, is the help these pages give towards forming a unified view in which prayer and action are seen to lose their customary opposition. Important to this end is the attention here given to the Trinitarian character of St. Ignatius' spirituality, a mysticism in his own case which descends from God to creatures there to find Him again by actively collaborating with the divine plan of Creation and Redemption. "A mysticism of the glory of God," Fr. Courel writes, "is necessarily a Trinitarian mysticism and a mysticism of return to the Father. But it is at the same time a mysticism of return to the world and to apostolic activity." Fr. Giuliani is more condensed: "Our works 'extend' to the neighbor the love which unites us to the Most Blessed Trinity."

The editors of *Christus* wish to present the Ignatian spirituality to readers who are unacquainted with it or even afraid of it. In the essay entitled "Movements of the Spirit" Fr. Giuliani expounds an element of this spirituality which has frightened even some of the sons of Ignatius. The Saint attached great importance to spiritual experiences as additional means to know the will of God for individual souls. The question may be asked whether the fear of confusing a purely human psychology with divine movements has not been carried to the point of discouraging the way of docility to the Holy Ghost. At any rate many readers will get from this essay a bolder view of St. Ignatius as a discerner of spirits; they will see, too, why the Saint set such great store on "repetitions" in the Exercises.

In this richly-laden book the reader will find much to enlighten him and some things, perhaps, to puzzle him. He may wonder at times if the authors realize what weak vessels we readers are. So serenely they move through the spiritual stratosphere! But they have much success in carrying out the purpose; they bring greater clarity to our understanding of the lofty Ignatian goal, a clarity which can make the accomplishment less remote and less unattainable.

FREDERICK A. HARKINS, S.J.

ONE FOLD. Essays and Documents to Commemorate the Golden Jubilee of the Chair of Unity Octave, 1908-1959. Edited by Edward Hanahoe, S.A., and Titus Cranny, S.A. Graymoor: Franciscan Friars of the Atonement, 1959. Pp. 383. $6.50.

This collection is divided into two parts. Part one has been devoted to the Octave proper and includes addresses by Most Rev. William Scully, Bishop of Albany, and by Father Connell, C.SS.R.; several official documents pertaining to the Octave; and two essays: "The Chair of Unity Octave: 1908-1959" by Titus Cranny, S.A., and "The Papal Emphasis in the Octave," by Edward Hanahoe, S.A. The second part consists of essays on a variety of subjects: "The Necessity of the Church," by Francis Connell, C.SS.R.; "The Concept of Catholic Ecumenism," by Charles Boyer, S.J.; "The Eastern Rites of the Catholic Church," by Clement Englert, C.SS.R.; "Image Breakers of Constantinople," by Theophane Carroll, O.F.M.; "The Anglican Mind," by Roger Matzerath, S.A.; "Ecumenism and American Converts," by Francis Curran, S.J.; "The Meaning of Atonement," by Kenneth Dougherty, S.A.; "Judaism and Christianity Today," by Ralph Thomas, S.A.; "Mary and the Church in St. Ambrose," by Gregory Figueroa, S.A.; "*Vestigia Ecclesiae:* Their Meaning and Value," by Edward Hanahoe, S.A. Its essays thus cover the history of the Chair of Unity Octave; the perspective proper to Catholic ecumenism; as well as several particular topics which will be of great interest to those concerned with current ecumenism. As a commemorative collection this volume is most appropriate.

While all of the essays are interesting and informative, it is the last which seems to require comment, both because of its length (111 pages) and its subject matter. Ecumenical writers have shown an increasing insistence that some recognition be given to the good elements which exist in non-Catholic groups. To this reviewer's knowledge this insistence goes back some forty years and is found in both Catholic and non-Catholic authors. Not all have used the expression *vestigia ecclesiae;* but there is now an ever widening acceptance of this term to signify those elements of the true religion which are still to be found in non-Catholic bodies. The expression is thus applied to a wide range of objects, beliefs, and practices ranging from the sacrament of baptism to the Christmas crib.

The subject is fully worthy of the emphasis it has received—obviously there are many good elements in non-Catholic faiths. And the question presents itself—What relation do these elements have to the salvation of non-Catholics? There have been many answers, some

of which have not sufficiently respected the data of Revelation and have thus brought confusion rather than clarity to the question. For some, *vestigia ecclesiae* represent parts of the true Church—the Church of Christ being the sum total of all that is good in all Christian denominations. Others have seen the *vestigia* as granting partial membership in the Church. For still others the *vestigia* are means of salvation in themselves. These views are scattered through a large segment of ecumenical writing.

To this reviewer's knowledge Fr. Hanahoe's is the first systematic treatment of these *vestigia*. The essay effectively fits the understanding of these elements into the existing framework of theological truth. It classifies the manifold ways in which the expression *vestigia ecclesiae* can be applied and clearly determines the value of each application. The *vestigia* cannot be considered parts of the Church; they cannot confer partial membership; they cannot in themselves be means of salvation. Thus they cannot be used as arguments in favor of non-Catholic bodies. What they can do is to provide the basis for an individual's intention of entering the Church—be that intention explicit or implicit. Some will perhaps disagree with these statements but they seem solidly established by the *analogia fidei* which, in the absence of direct magisterial statements, is the sole means of establishing clarity here.

Father Hanahoe's essay deserves close consideration. For theologians must eventually come to the general acceptance of the assertion that it is only through the personal dispositions and intentions of the individual that these *vestigia* can serve to promote supernatural life. Thus it remains literally true that a non-Catholic is never saved through his participation in the life of his religious body but rather through his union with the true Church of Christ. This essay is one giant step in that direction. Assuredly we must be willing to speak as well as we can of non-Catholics and their denominations; but if the *vestigia* which they possess are for them means of salvation, if they are authentic Christian values which give them membership, however attenuated, in the Church of Christ, then the issue of re-union is neither urgent nor important. It is merely an attractive goal of accidental importance.

Ecumenical literature has been considerably enriched by the publication of this collection of essays and documents. For fifty years the Society of the Atonement has been sincerely promoting the cause of Christian unity. This volume is evidence that in the coming years it will continue to labor zealously "that all may be one."

JOHN J. KING, O.M.I.

THE DEVIL'S ADVOCATE. By Morris L. West. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1959. Pp. 319. $3.95.

This is an improbable tale composed of implausible situations and unconvincing characters that ends up surprisingly as a quite believeable novel.

The story is that of a proper but frustrated English cleric, Blaise Meredith, dying of cancer, who is sent from Rome as devil's advocate to investigate the case of a supposed saint executed by communist partisans in a small Calabrian village at the close of the World War II.

The novel concerns itself not only with the discovery of the heroic and selfless character of the deserter from the British Army, the "Saint" known as Nerone, but with Monsignor Meredith's growth in understanding and compassion, and consequent discovery of himself.

There is the inevitable agnostic doctor, made miserable both by the truths he cannot embrace and the truths he cannot avoid; Nina, the peasant mistress of Nerone; a British painter, a somewhat garishly-portrayed tortured invert bent on the corruption of Nerone's illegitimate son; a pathetic old village priest vaguely reminiscent of Greene's hero in *Labyrinthine Ways;* a frustrated contessa, a fastidious nymphomaniac, who finally finds some meaning in a life characterized by affluent corruption.

This story simply should not come off, so to speak. The clerics are joyless and cynical. They speak cleverly, and sometimes wisely, but in an alien imagery; and it is assumed that celibacy depersonalizes, and that Vatican office work dries up the well-springs of faith. As for the contessa: the nymphomaniac, more than an aberrant psychological type, is more often a product of the febrile imagination of contemporary male novelists which seems about to supersede the wanton with the heart of gold as the modern novel's most endearing young charm.

Furthermore, although Mr. West has the privilege of making his characters speak in any way he wishes, this reviewer finds it hard to imagine Italian peasants hurling names like "Christ-killer" at the Jewish doctor who ostensibly has been of great service to them. We are all familiar with the "But-what-have-you-done-for-me-lately?" type of ingratitude, of course. It is not ingratitude, but this manifestation of ingratitude that is hard to believe.

We never learn of the result of the preparation of Nerone's cause, although Monsignor Meredith's report is commendatory; but it might be suggested too, that even a generous man fathering children with-

out benefit of matrimony is not an apt subject for canonization. It would seem that in Nerone's case, the devil's advocate has simply too much to advocate.

It seems highly inconsistent that one can be such a captious critic of plot and character, and still be enthusiastic about the book in which they are found. But even if one is unimpressed by Mr. West's characters, he can hardly ignore the occasionally brilliant *aperçu,* and masterful conversation pieces that the novel contains.

Mr. West writes in a brilliantly simple style, and has an obvious compassion for human frailty—without wallowing in it. We may not be edified by what these people do (and we are not unnecessarily shocked, as their divagations on the primrose path of dalliance are not charted in detail), but the author leaves no doubt in our minds as to why they do what they do.

In fine, one can find little in this novel to help us understand the minutiae of canonization, the life of Roman ecclesiastics, or even the joy of an authentic faith; but one can find in this highly readable tale, besides fine writing, an example of growth in compassion, such as Bloy must have had in mind when he wrote: "Man has places in his heart which do not yet exist; and into them enters suffering in order that they may have existence."

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD. By Benedict Baur, O.S.B. Translated from the German by Edward Malone, O.S.B., Revised Edition, St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1958. Volume I, Advent and the Christmas Cycle. Pp. xv + 278. $4.75. Volume II, The Easter Cycle. Pp. 383. $5.50.

This book is a series of liturgical meditations for Sundays and weekdays of the year based on the texts of the Mass and the Office. The author is less concerned with a scientific exegesis of the texts and more concerned with the use the Church has made of them in the liturgy and their application to our lives.

Those familiar with the earlier English edition of this work will find that it remains substantially the same. There are some changes such as in the meditation upon the feast of the Immaculate Conception, but the real changes are mostly in layout. The new volumes are in a handier size than the old ones, but to gain this new size, the book has now been split into three volumes. A welcome change is the clear marking of the day for which meditation is intended.

In the preface to the revised German edition from which this book was translated, Baur indicates that one of the principal reasons for this revision was the need to treat "of the feast of the saints, insofar as they are not closely integrated with the liturgical year." But it is just this point that is likely to be missed by the readers of this English edition since the volumes on saints have been published separately by Herder under the title, *Saints of the Missal.*

This new edition should provide good food for meditation for any priest or religious. The meditations are ample, the translation is good, and the liturgical texts give one good insights into the liturgy of the Church. It should help make meditation a real act of religion.

J. Justin McCormick, C.S.P.

Books Received

From the Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago.

THE FRANCISCAN BOOK OF SAINTS. By Marion A. Habig, O.F.M. Pp. xxxiv + 1006. $12.50. This book was first published as *The Poverello's Round Table*, by Sister M. Aquina Barth, O.S.F. It is now completely revised and greatly augmented.

THE VOICE OF YOUR FATHER. By Martin X. Wolfer, O.F.M. Pp. xvi + 400. $5.00.

TEETH IN THE DEVIL'S HIDE. THE LIFE OF PÈRE MARIE-ANTOINE, O.F.M.CAP., 1825-1907. By Ernest-Marie de Beaulieu, O.F.M.Cap. Translated and adapted by Gregory Van der Becken, O.F.M.Cap. Pp. 184. $3.75.

AN APOSTLE OF TWO WORLDS. FATHER FREDERIC JANSSOONE, O.F.M., OF GHYVELDE. By Romain Legare, O.F.M. Translated by Raphael Brown. Pp. 380. $4.50

NOTHING FOR YOUR JOURNEY. By Efrem Bettoni, O.F.M. Translated by Bruce Malina, O.F.M. Pp. 165. $2.50.

THE CHANGING HEART. THE PENANCE-CONCEPT OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By Chrysostomus Dukker, O.F.M. Translated by Bruce Malina, O.F.M. Pp. 156. $3.00.

THE ART OF PRAYER. By Martial Lekeux, O.F.M. Translated by Paul Joseph Oligny, O.F.M. Pp. vi + 306. $5.00.

THE ORDER OF ST. FRANCIS: ITS SPIRIT AND ITS MISSION IN THE KINGDOM OF GOD. By Cajetan Esser, O.F.M. Translated by Ignatius Brady, O.F.M. Pp. 60. $1.75.

SERAPH OF LOVE. By Placid Herman, O.F.M. Pp. 128. $250.

From the Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland.

THE PRIMACY OF CHARITY IN MORAL THEOLOGY. By Gérard Gilleman, S.J. Translated from the second French edition by William F. Ryan, S.J., and André Vachon, S.J. Pp. xxxviii + 420. $5.50.

CHRISTIANITY IN CONFLICT. A CATHOLIC VIEW OF PROTESTANTISM. By John A. Hardon, S.J. Pp. xiii + 300. $4.50.

1859 IN REVIEW. By Thomas P. Neill. Pp. xxx + 203. $2.75.

THE SIN OF THE ANGEL. AN ESSAY ON A RE-INTERPRETATION OF SOME THOMISTIC POSITIONS. By Jacques Maritain. Translated by William L. Rossner, S.J. Pp. xv + 106. $3.00.

THE CATHOLIC DIMENSION IN HIGHER EDUCATION. By Justus George Lawler. With an Introduction by Leo R. Ward, C.S.C. Pp. xxviii + 302. $3.95.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE AND MYTH. THE THEOLOGY OF RUDOLF BULTMANN. By L. Malevez, S.J. Pp. 215. $4.50.

FROM GETHSEMANI TO CALVARY. By Père Charmot, S.J. Translated from the French by Richard H. Brenan, S.J. Pp. 71. $1.50.

WOMEN, WORDS AND WISDOM. By Solange Hertz. Pp. 184. $3.50.

From the Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee.

MANUAL OF CANON LAW. By Fernando Della Rocca. Translated by Anselm Thatcher, O.S.B. Pp. xx + 624. $9.50.

TRACTATUS DOGMATICUS DE ORDINE. Tom. II *De Institutione* (Cont.), *De Materia et Forma*. By Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I. Pp. 859 + 38. $19.00.

From Sheed and Ward, New York.

THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By Thomas à Kempis. Translated by Ronald Knox and Michael Oakley. Pp. 217. $2.50.

SAINTS WHO MADE HISTORY. THE FIRST FIVE CENTURIES. By Maisie Ward. Pp. xiv + 377. $4.50.

From the Paulist Press, New York.

THE LAW GIVEN THROUGH MOSES. Introduction to the Pentateuch. By Neil J. McEleney, C.S.P. Pp. 32.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. Part I with a Commentary. By Ignatius Hunt, O.S.B. Pp. 96.

These constitute volumes 1 and 2 of the *Pamphlet Bible Series*.

From the Macmillan Company, New York.

ST. JOSEPH AND DAILY CHRISTIAN LIVING. REFLECTIONS ON HIS LIFE AND DEVOTION. By Francis L. Filas, S.J. Pp. x + 182. $3.95.

From Harper and Brothers, New York.

HOLY WRIT OR HOLY CHURCH. THE CRISIS OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION. By George H. Tavard. Pp. 250. $5.00.

From Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ARTIST. By Jacques Maritain. Pp. 120. $2.95.

From Henry Regnery Company, Chicago.

JESUS CHRISTUS. MEDITATIONS. By Romano Guardini. Translated by Peter White. Pp. 111. $2.75.

From the Peter Reilly Company, Philadelphia.

THE GREAT AND LITTLE ONE OF PRAGUE. By Ludvik Nemec. Pp. 279. $4.50.

From The World Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York.

ENCOUNTERS. By Daniel Berrigan. Pp. 76. $3.50.

From Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, New York.

ST. MARGARET MARY. APOSTLE OF THE SACRED HEART. Pp. 187. $1.95.

From Editions Spes, Paris.

L'ÉGLISE ET LES CENTRES URBAINS. By Jean Labbens. Pp. 137. 420 francs.